

Montana

Consolidated State Application



for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Requested Application Submission: June 12, 2002

Montana Office of Public Instruction
OMB No. 1810-0576
Expires 11.30.2002

June 2002
Page i of 87

DATED MATERIAL-OPEN IMMEDIATELY

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Introduction

Authority
Official Documents Notice
Eligibility
Purpose of the Consolidated State Application
Transmittal Instructions

Consolidated State Application Signature Page

Instructions for Signature Page

**Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act Chief Executive Officer
Cover Sheet**

ESEA Programs Included in the Consolidated Application

Checklist

Consolidated State Application Contents

Part I: ESEA Goals and Indicators
Part II: State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs
Part III: ESEA Key Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information

GEPA Requirements

Assurances and Certifications

General and Cross-Cutting Assurances
Certification
ESEA Program Specific Assurances

Appendix A

Application for Competitive Grants Under Title VI, Subpart I, Section 6112

The Consolidated State Application is on the Department of Education's website at
<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/esea/regsandguidance.html>.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

AUTHORITY

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) reauthorized as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), Title IX, Part C, Sections 9301-9306. The NCLB can be found at: <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/>

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS NOTICE

The official document governing this application is the Federal Register Notice of final requirements for the consolidated application published in the Federal Register on June __, 2002. This Notice is available electronically at the following web sites:

<http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html> and
<http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister>.

ELIGIBILITY

The State educational agency, after consultation with the Governor, may submit a consolidated State application for each of the covered programs (Section 9101(13)) in which the State participates, and such other programs as the Secretary may designate. (Note: Section 9305 extends local educational agencies receiving funds under more than one covered program the option of submitting a consolidated plan or application to the State educational agency. The SEA, in consultation with the Governor, is required to collaborate with LEAs in establishing procedures for submission of these plans or applications, and to require “only descriptions, information, assurances, and other material that are absolutely necessary for the consideration of the [LEA] plan or application.”)

PURPOSE OF THE CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION

The Consolidated State Application is informed by the overall philosophy of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The Application is an expression of the key principles of President George W. Bush’s education reform plan:

1. Stronger accountability for results,
2. Increased State and local flexibility and reduced “red tape,”
3. Expanded choices for parents, and
4. An emphasis on teaching methods that have been proven to work.

Section 9302 of NCLB provides to States the option of applying for multiple ESEA program funds through a single consolidated application. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application is to reduce “red tape” and burden on States, the Consolidated Application is also intended to have the important pedagogical purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in

comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the SEA will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs.

The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The design of the Consolidated State Application fosters the goal of a coherent, well-integrated, and comprehensive educational plan in the following ways:

1. Part I of the Application provides Goals and Indicators that focus on student achievement, leaving no child behind. The five goals address levels of academic proficiency that all students would meet, the special needs of certain populations of students, and factors such as qualified teachers and school safety that are critical to improved teaching and learning. Underlying the five goals is the presumption that all State, local, and federal educational resources will be integrated and coordinated to reach the overarching goal of improved student achievement.
2. Part II of the Application continues the theme of comprehensive, coordinated planning and service delivery. In addition to providing the framework for standards, assessments, and accountability, Part II suggests that State strategies and activities undertaken with administrative funds from ESEA programs reflect in their implementation cross-program efforts. For example, the part of the State plan providing for technical assistance to local districts might be one consolidated plan that provides for comprehensive service delivery for all programs rather than that the process of technical assistance be fragmented and dependent on specific, individual program requirements.
3. Part III of the Application, "Key Programmatic and Fiscal Information," addresses the Department's overall responsibility for ensuring the programmatic and fiscal integrity of the ESEA programs. To meet this responsibility, the Department needs to review and approve information on how the State would comply with a few key requirements of the individual ESEA programs included in the Application. Part III is intended to provide information that will assist the Department in its work but also to support comprehensive, integrated State planning and service delivery by aligning with the five goals of Part I. Each of the ESEA programs included in the consolidated application can assist States in addressing one or more of the ESEA goals described in Part I of the application. One model for the relationship between the five goals of Part I and the individual programmatic and fiscal requirements in Part III is suggested in the chart below. The chart, "Alignment between ESEA Programs and ESEA Goals," shows in the shaded cells how one or more of the five ESEA goals are supported by the individual ESEA programs included in the application.

Alignment between ESEA Programs and ESEA Goals

ESEA Goals

Program	Goal 1: Reading and Math	Goal 2: English for LEP students	Goal 3: Qualified Teachers	Goal 4: Learning Environments	Goal 5: Graduation
Title I, Part A					
Title I, Part B, 3					
Title I, Part C					
Title I, Part D					
Title I, Part F					
Title II, Part A					
Title II, Part D					
Title III, Part A					
Title IV, Part A, 1					
Title IV, Part A, 2					
Title IV, Part B					
Title V, Part A					
Title VI, Part A, 1, 6111					
Title VI, Part A, 1, 6112					
Title VI, Part B, 2					

Submission of Information and Date

Descriptive information and data requested in Parts I through III of the Application will be submitted at different times. The information about the individual ESEA programs included in Part III (“Key Programmatic and Fiscal Information”) of the application and the strategies or timelines for implementing them in ways that focus on increased student achievement (Part II, “State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs”) will be due **June 12, 2002**. The State’s agreement to adopt the five ESEA Goals and the related Indicators (Part I), as well as a statement that the State will identify performance targets and submit baseline data for the targets when requested in 2003, is also due **June 12, 2002**.

In **January of 2003**, a description of how the State calculated its “starting point” as required for adequate yearly progress (AYP), the State definition of AYP, and the minimum number of students the State has determined to be sufficient to yield statistically reliable information will be due.

The States performance targets, related to the ESEA Goals and Indicators, will be due in the **spring of 2003**. Baseline data for AYP data and for related performance targets also will be due in the **spring of 2003**. Baseline data for non-AYP performance targets will be due in the **fall of 2003**.

Timelines that States submit for standards, assessments and accountability systems or other data requirements must describe the major milestones or key steps the State will carry out to meet the requirement. The timeline should provide enough information to

demonstrate that all critical steps will be carried out in a timely way and that the State will be able to meet the requirement.

The Timeline Submission Chart below shows actual estimated due dates for submission of application information.

Timeline for Submission of Components of the Consolidated State Application

Application Section	Topic*	Date Due							
		6-12-02	9-15-02	1-31-03	5-01-03	9-01-03	5-01-06	12-01-06	12-01-08
Part I	Goals and Indicators								
	Adoption of Goals and Indicators	√							
	Setting State Targets				√				
	AYP Baseline Data				√				
	Non-AYP Baseline Data					√			
Part II	State Activities								
	1a Adopting academic content standards/grade-level expectations in math and reading				Evidence				
	1b Adopting academic content standards/grade-level expectations in science				Detailed timeline		Evidence		
	1c Developing and implementing required assessments				Detailed timeline			Evidence of 3-8	Evidence of science
	1d Setting academic achievement standards				Detailed timeline			Evidence of 3-8	Evidence of science
	1e Calculating starting point			√					
	1f Definition of AYP			√					
	1g Minimum number for statistical reliability & justification			√					
	1h Evidence of single accountability system	Plan			Evidence				
	1i Languages present, assessments in, assessments needed in	√							
	1j LEA assessment of English proficiency	√							
	1k Standards and objective for English proficiency	Status of efforts			Measurable objective				
	2 Subgrant process for each program with competitive subgrants	√							
	3 State system for monitoring, professional development, and technical assistance	√							
	4 Statewide system of support under Sec 1117	√							
	5 Activities related to: schoolwides, teacher quality, technology, parental and community involvement, securing baseline and follow-up data	√							
	6 Coordination of programs	√							
	7 Strategies for determining subgrantee progress	√							
Part III	Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information								
	ALL	√							
	Assurances & Certifications								
	ALL	√							
Appendix	Sec 6112 Enhanced State Assessments								

	ALL		√						
--	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

* Topics are listed in abbreviated form. See body of application package for full text of submission requirements.

Data Management

Additional considerations that guide the procedures for the consolidated State application include the Department's data management initiatives for the electronic collection of data and information. During 2002 and beyond, the Department will work with LEAs and SEAs to establish data standards for performance indicators and other information collected from States and districts. The Department will also confer with LEA and SEA officials, the research community information technology vendors, and other interested parties on ways in which States, LEAs, and schools can collect and record useful baseline and follow-up data through an Internet-based format. The new format will accommodate the measurement of success relative to the various indicators that the Department and States have adopted. Future application and reporting guidelines, therefore, will encourage electronic reporting and provide States with additional options in fulfilling federal information requests.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt, review and approval of applications, please send your application via the Internet as a .doc file or an .rtf or .txt file or provide (to marcia.kingman@ed.gov) the URL for the site where your application is posted on the Internet. Send to conapp@ed.gov. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Application Signature Page" and "Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act Chief Executive Officer Cover Sheet" via an express carrier.

A State that submits only a paper application must include one signed original and eight additional copies.

Mail to

Marcia J. Kingman
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave.
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0576. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 150 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651. If you have any comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to Consolidated State Application, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E213, Washington, D.C. 20202-6400.

Montana Office of Public Instruction
OMB No. 1810-0576
Expires 11.30.2002

June 2002
Page 6 of 87

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SIGNATURE PAGE

1. **Legal Name of Applicant.** Enter the legal name of applicant and the name of the primary organizational unit that will undertake the assistance activity.
2. **D-U-N-S Number.** Enter the applicant's D-U-N-S Number. If your organization does not have a D-U-N-S Number, you can obtain the number by calling 1-800-333-0505 or by completing a D-U-N-S Number Request Form. The form can be obtained via the Internet at the following URL: <http://www.dnb.com>.
Taxpayer Identification Number. Enter the taxpayer's identification number as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.
3. **Address.** Enter the address of the Applicant Agency (#1).
4. **Program Contact.** Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and email address of the person to be contacted on matters involving this application.
5. **Federal Debt Delinquency.** Check "Yes" if the SEA is delinquent on any Federal debt. (This question refers to the applicant's organization and not to the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes.) Otherwise, check "No."
6. **Certification of Assurances and Application Contents.** To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office.

SAFE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT STATE GRANTS

Chief Executive Officer Cover Sheet

<p>1. Legal Name of Applicant Agency (Chief Executive Office): Office of the Governor State of Montana</p>	<p>2. DUNS Number: 606864478</p>
<p>3. Address (including zip code): State Capitol PO Box 200801 Helena MT 59620-0801 Address for administering agency Montana Board of Crime Control 3075 N Montana Ave PO Box 201408 Helena MT 59620-1408</p>	<p>4. Contact Person Name: Jim Oppedahl Position: Executive Director Telephone: (406) 444-3604 Fax: (406) 444-4722 E-Mail Address: www.mbcc.state.mt.us</p>
<p>5. Reservation of Funds: _20% Indicate the amount the Governor wishes to reserve (up to 20%) of the total State SDFSCA State Grant allocation.</p>	
<p>6. By signing this form the Governor certifies the following: a. The following assurances and certifications covering the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program have been filed with the U.S. Department of Education (either as a part of this Application or through another submission from the State): i. <u>Section 14303 and EDGAR</u>. The assurances in Section 9304(a) of the ESEA, and Section 76.104 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). ii. <u>ESEA Program Assurances</u>. Any assurances or certifications included in the statutes governing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program. iii. <u>Assurances and Certification</u>. Any assurances or certifications included in the Application under “Assurances and Certifications.” iv. <u>Cross-Cutting</u>. As applicable, the assurances in OMB Standard Form 424B (Government-wide Assurances for Non-Construction Programs.)v. <u>Lobbying; debarment/suspension; drug-free workplace</u>. The three certification in ED Form 80-0013 and 80-0014, relating to lobbying, debarment/suspension, and drug-free workplace. (For more information, see 61 <i>Fed. Reg.</i> 1412 (01.19.96.) b. As of the date of submission of this Application, none of the facts has changed upon which those certifications and assurances were made.</p>	
<p>7. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data are true and correct. The governing body of the applicant has duly authorized the document and the applicant will comply with the assurances and certification provided in this package if the assistance is awarded.</p>	
<p>8. Typed name of Chief Executive Officer Judy Martz</p>	<p>9. Telephone Number: (406) 444-3111</p>
<p>10. Signature of Chief Executive Officer</p>	<p>11. Date</p>

ESEA PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN THE CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION

CHECKLIST

The State of Montana requests funds for the programs indicated below:

- XX Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- XX Title I, Part B, Subpart 3: Even Start Family Literacy
- XX Title I, Part C: Education of Migrant Children
- XX Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- XX Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform
- XX Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund
- XX Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology
- XX Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement
- XX Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1: Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities
- XX Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2: Community Service Grants
- XX Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- XX Title V, Part A: Innovative Programs
- XX Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111: State Assessment Program
- *XX Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6112: Enhanced Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant Program
- XX Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income Schools

*Montana will apply as part of a multi-state consortium.

SEA CONTACTS FOR ESEA PROGRAMS

ESEA Program Title	SEA Program Contact		
	Name	Phone	E-Mail address
Title I, Part A	BJ Granbery	(406) 444-4420	bgranbery@state.mt.us
Title I, Part B, 3	Joan Morris	(406) 444-3083	jmorris@state.mt.us
Title I, Part C	Angela Branz-Spall	(406) 444-2423	angelab@state.mt.us
Title I, Part D	Terry Teichrow	(406) 444-2036	tteichrow@state.mt.us
Title I, Part F	Ron Lukenbill	(406) 444-2080	rlukenbill@state.mt.us
Title II, Part A	Patricia Johnson	(406) 444-2736	patjohnson@state.mt.us
Title III, Part A	Lynn Hinch	(406) 444-3482	lhinch@state.mt.us
Title IV, Part A (SEA)	Cathy Kendall	(406) 444-0829	ckendall@state.mt.us
Title IV, Part A (Governor)	Jim Oppedahl	(406) 444-3615	joppedahl@state.mt.us
Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2	Cathy Kendall	(406) 444-0829	ckendall@state.mt.us
Title IV, Part B	Cathy Kendall	(406) 444-0829	ckendall@state.mt.us
Title V, Part A	Patricia Johnson	(406) 444-2736	patjohnson@state.mt.us
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6111	Michael Hall	(406) 444-4422	mhall@state.mt.us
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6112	Nancy Coopersmith	(406) 444-5541	ncoopersmith@state.mt.us
Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2	Michael Hall	(406) 444-4422	mhall@state.mt.us
Title II, Part D	Michael Hall	(406) 444-4422	mhall@state.mt.us

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION CONTENTS

Montana Office of Public Instruction
 OMB No. 1810-0576
 Expires 11.30.2002

June 2002
 Page 11 of 87

PART I: ESEA GOALS, ESEA INDICATORS, STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS

The Montana Office of Public Instruction has adopted the five ESEA goals, the corresponding indicators and agrees to submit targets and baseline data related to the goals and indicators identified in the application (by May 2003). For purposes of these Goals and Indicators, the term “each subgroup” is defined (from section 1111 of ESEA) as including race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and economically disadvantaged.

Montana and ESEA Performance Goals and Indicators

1. **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
 - 1.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State’s assessment.
 - 1.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State’s assessment.
 - 1.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.

2. **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
 - 2.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.
 - 2.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State’s assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.
 - 2.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State’s assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

3. **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
 - 3.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
 - 3.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34)).

- 3.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.
4. **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- 4.1. Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.
- 0 (The policy defining persistently dangerous schools was established in April 2002, therefore no data is available at this time.)

The state of Montana through its SEA certifies that it has established and implemented a statewide policy requiring that students attending persistently dangerous public elementary or secondary schools, as determined by the State (in consultation with a representative sample of local educational agencies), or who become victims of violent criminal offenses, as determined by State law, while in or on the grounds of public elementary and secondary schools that the students attend, be allowed to choose to attend a different, safe public elementary or secondary school (which may include a public charter school) within the local education agency.

The SEA consulted with LEAs and associations involved with public education in Montana. Based on that consultation, the SEA developed the following definition of "persistently dangerous public elementary school or secondary school." This definition will be used in Montana to (a) establish State compliance with the federal requirement set forth in ESEA, and (b) determine if any Montana schools are "persistently dangerous" thus invoking the statutorily set requirements that students in the identified school be allowed to attend a safe public elementary or secondary school within the local education agency.

Pursuant to this Act, the Office of Public Instruction adopts this operational definition: "Persistently Dangerous Public Elementary School or Secondary School: In the context of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, a Montana public elementary or secondary school is considered to be persistently dangerous if each of the following two conditions exist:

- (a) In each of three consecutive years, the school has a federal or state gun-free schools violation or a violent criminal offense has been committed on school property, and
- (b) In any two years within a three-year period, the school has experienced expulsions for drug, alcohol, weapons or violence that exceed one of the following rates-

- (1) more than five expulsions for a school of less than 250 students,

- (2) more than ten expulsions for a school of more than 250 students but less than 1,000 students, or
- (3) more than fifteen expulsions for a school of more than 1,000 students.

For the purpose of this definition, a "violent criminal offense" shall mean homicide, rape, robbery, and/or aggravated assault.

5. **Performance goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma,
 - disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged;
 - calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.
- 5.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school,
 - disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged;
 - calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

(Note: NCES' definition of "high school dropout," i.e., a student in grades 9-12 who (a) was enrolled in the district at sometime during the previous school year; (b) was not enrolled at the beginning of the succeeding school year; (c) has not graduated or completed a program of studies by the maximum age established by the State; (d) has not transferred to another public school district or to a non-public school or to a State-approved educational program; and (e) has not left school because of death, illness, or school-approved absence.

PART II: STATE ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT ESEA PROGRAMS

- 1. See the attached Compliance Agreement and Request for Proposals for further details of Montana's standards, assessment, and accountability system.
 - a. Challenging academic content standards in reading and mathematics for end of grade 4, end of grade 8, and upon graduation were developed by broad-based groups of Montana educators and were adopted by the Montana Board of Public Education for inclusion in the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) effective November 1998. The process of articulating grade level expectations in reading and math for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 will begin in August 2002 with a group of Montana educators convened to begin drafts of this work while also reviewing and revising, as necessary, the performance descriptors in reading and math which were originally written in conjunction with content standards in reading and math (See Compliance Agreement Action Plan; Requirement 1). This group will be reconvened in September and December 2002 to refine the

grade level expectations drafts and will meet again in February or March, 2003 to complete the work of delineating grade level expectations so that each of grades 3-8 and grade 11 have clearly defined expectations in reading and math. The grade level expectations will be presented to the Board of Public Education for approval in April 2003, and will be disseminated to school districts in May 2003.

- b. Montana has already adopted challenging academic content standards in science for end of grade 4, end of grade 8, and upon graduation. These were adopted by the Montana Board of Education for inclusion in the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) and became effective October 1999.
- c. On February 1, 2002, Montana issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for criterion-referenced tests (CRT's) in reading and mathematics for grades 3-8 and grade 11 and CRT's in science for grades 4, 8, and 11. (See attached RFP.) The RFP called for "off-the-shelf" tests to be augmented under the contract with additional items as necessary to ensure complete alignment. The Notice of Award was posted in late April 2002 awarding the contract to the highest scoring Offeror. The CRT's in reading and math for grades 4, 8, and 11 will be piloted in May 2003 and will be fully administered in April 2004. The CRT's in reading and math for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 will be piloted in April 2005 and will be fully administered (along with grades 4, 8, and 11) in April 2006. The CRT in science will be piloted in April 2007 and will be fully administered in April 2008. The technical manuals will be completed as follows:
 - Grades 4, 8, and 11 reading and math – October 2004
 - Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 reading and math – October 2006
 - Grades 4, 8, and 11 science – October, 2008(See attached Compliance Agreement for more detail as well as Section 2 of the RFP – Scope of Work.)
- d. Academic achievement standards will be set after the first full administration of each CRT according to the following schedule so that student test data are available:
 - Grades 4, 8, and 11 reading and math – by August 2004
 - Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 reading and math – by August 2006
 - Grades 4, 8, and 11 science – by August 2008

Achievement levels (labels) and the performance descriptors already reviewed will be used. The performance descriptors for reading and math will be reviewed in August 2002 and performance descriptors for science will be reviewed by August 2005. Actual cut scores for each level will be established. (See attached Compliance Agreement for more detail.)

- e. – g. not due June 2002

h. The academic achievement of all public schools on the assessments described above and those used in transition will be examined, analyzed, and evaluated yearly regardless of whether or not the school receives, Title I, Part A or other federal funds. Any public school not meeting the established criteria for adequate yearly progress will be identified for improvement. (Previously, only schools and districts receiving Title I, Part A funds were identified.) The rewards and sanctions in Section 1116 will apply only to those schools and districts receiving Title I, Part A funds, however, as stated in the statute. This change to a single accountability system for all public schools (at least as far as identification for improvement status) has been discussed with educators across the state in regional workshops and a statewide teleconference. No legislative or regulatory changes are needed to accomplish this change, which will go into effect upon receipt and analysis of the April 2002 assessment data, which will be ready for public dissemination by September 2002. The resources and capacity to take these actions are the same as those needed to take the same actions with only schools and districts receiving Title I, Part A funds.

i. The following chart identifies the 75 plus languages present in the LEP population in the state. This data was collected through the annual LEP survey sent to all 349 school districts in the state in February of 2002 and reported to the Office of English Language Acquisition of the U.S. Department of Education in April 2002.

Language	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Ungraded K-8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Arabic				1	1				1			1	2		6
Arapaho						1		2			1	3		1	8
Assiniboine	55	44	51	65	65	51	66	30	39		36	32	24	13	571
Blackfeet	29	146	157	179	143	189	189	177	189		219	152	110	29	1908
Cheyenne	46	34	47	35	49	39	52	35	47		38	45	32	26	525
Chinese	1	5	1	1	3		2		2			1	3	5	24
Chippewa	3	2	2	4	5	1	9	7	2		7	6	4	3	55
Cree	14	8	14	19	21	18	22	18	18		13	7	4	7	183
Croatian															0
Cro	94	89	88	89	102	107	100	102	111		79	85	60	72	1178
Czech	3		1	1									1	1	7
Farsi											1		1		2
Finnish													1		1
French		1									1		1	2	5
German	23	49	46	54	27	25	22	22	21		1	1	2	7	300
Gros Ventre	33	23	26	28	26	32	30	14	10		13	11	17	18	281
Hindi, Hindustani				1			1							1	3
Hmong	3	10	13	6	10	7	10	8	6		11	6	6	10	106
Japanese					1	1	1		1		3		4	1	12
Kootenai	12	11	4	9	6	2	2	6	3		3	2	4	3	67

Language	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Ungraded K-8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Korean					1								1		2
Navajo												2	1		3
Nepalese															0
Norwegian							1								1
Oneida															0
Polish		1													1
Portugese											1				1
Romanian							1						1	1	3
Russian	10	9	9	12	9	12	14	12	14		5	6	6	4	122
Salish	67	47	49	48	44	28	38	39	41		43	40	24	25	533
Shoshone			1	1	1	1	3	1			2	2	1		13
Sioux/Dakota	28	67	87	62	73	63	74	75	84		73	54	29	33	802
Spanish	13	11	9	10	16	6	11	19	10		15	4	4	12	140
Tagalog				1	1										2
Thai			1		1										2
Turkish															0
Urdu															0
Vietnamese	1				3	1	1	1	3		1	2	4		17
Other															0
Acoma Pueblo					2										2
Alaska Native	2	1													3
Aleut					1										1
Apache		1			1								1		3
Cherokee	1		2		1		1		1			2		2	10
Chippewa/Cree	43	42	27	34	30	33	19	41	29		28	20	10	9	365
Corville				1											1
Eskimo												2			2
Estonian							1								1
Hungarian													1		1
Hopi											1	1			2
Hebrew			1												1
Kiowa	1														1
Lebanese	1							1							2
Mandan Hidatsa	1														1
Metis		1			2	1	1		3		1	2	3	5	19
Mongolian			1								1		1		3
Native American		6	3	7	2	4	1			12					35
Nez Perce	1		1			1									3
Nisqually			1	1											2
Ojibwa														1	1
Omaha							1						1	2	4
Ottawa			1				1								2
Papago									1				1		2
Paiute														1	1
Pueblo													1		1
Quechuan							2								2
Salish & Kootenai					21	16	20	4	26				12		99
Samoan					1		1				2		1	1	6

Language	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Ungraded K-8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Shawnee								1							1
Three Affiliated Tribes	1			1		1	1	1			1	1		1	8
Tibetan						1		1	1						3
Tlingit				1					1						2
Unknown	3	3	5	9	10	6	1	2	5		10	17	15	4	90
Ute			1			1									2
Yalo,a	1														1
TOTAL	490	611	648	680	680	648	697	621	669	12	610	508	394	299	7567

Montana does not administer assessments in any of the languages on a statewide basis, nor will it be necessary under the new law. The primary languages of impact are American Indian languages, which are acquired as second languages for the majority of Indian students in the state. Local school districts administer assessments in these languages, primarily to assess oral proficiency. Literacy is not a primary goal of native language programs in Montana. Since children in Montana receive instruction in academic areas almost exclusively in English and do not benefit from literacy instruction in any of the languages listed above, except for some after-school instruction in Russian in one school district, administering assessment in any of these languages would not allow students to better demonstrate their knowledge or abilities.

- j. The majority (93%) of LEP students in Montana are American Indian students whose first language is English. These students enter school with English oral language skills and have generally acquired verbal fluency in English in their homes and communities. Their language needs center on background knowledge and vocabulary required for acquiring academic English for success in school. Because of this, assessment of LEP students in Montana has focused on vocabulary and reading comprehension. Districts with newly arrived immigrant children administer English language proficiency assessments, either the Woodcock Munoz or the IPT exam. The state of Montana provides no state money for serving LEP students, and very limited funding for statewide assessment overall. Since Montana does not administer a statewide English language proficiency assessment and has extremely limited funds to develop an appropriate assessment, the SEA has expressed interest to the parties involved through CCSSO and a consortium of Western states in researching and developing an English-language assessment that would meet Title I and Title III requirements and be more appropriate for the state population than instruments currently available. In order to utilize this opportunity to provide more reliable assessment of LEP students, for the 2002-03 school year, the SEA would request the continued use of the vocabulary and reading comprehension portions of the statewide assessment currently in place, the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, for students in grades 4th, 8th, and 11th. For districts that administer the tests in other grades, the Iowa would be used for LEP students in those grades. The Iowa Tests are administered in the spring. For districts that do not, the Woodcock Munoz or

IPT would be administered in the spring of 2003. The SEA anticipates that a new assessment instrument would be available for school year 2003-04.

- k. The Communication Arts content and performance standards approved by the Montana Board of Public Education include standards for attainment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing and comprehension (www.opi.state.mt.us/Standards/index.html). These are the standards observed by all districts in the state for all students in Montana.

2. Processes for awarding competitive subgrants for each program listed.

1) Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B)

The Educational, Opportunity and Equity Unit of the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) will manage the subgrant process for the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Program. The unit manages a number of competitive and allocation grant programs. The Even Start programs have developed relationships with state and local organizations, including local LEAs, Head Starts, Montana Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, Montana Child Care Association, Adult Basic Education, Higher Education Institutions, Welfare Reform Agencies, and Montana Parent Information and Resource Center. Montana State Consortium (Committee of Practitioners) reviews and approves all proposed publications including the RFP, applications, Montana Performance Indicators, the state plan and any Even Start rules and regulations).

Following are the Even Start grant procedure steps:

- Awards are given to all continuing Even Start programs if they have made sufficient progress towards meeting the Performance Indicators and other factors (longevity of the program and the program model).
- If additional funds are available for subgranting and/or if one of the current Even Start program is re-competing for their fifth or ninth year and beyond of funding, a new competitive subgrant(s) process will begin.
- Invitations announcing technical assistance workshops are sent to all LEA's, community based organizations and libraries in Montana.
- Applications are distributed and discussed at the technical assistance workshops in two or three locations around the state. Submission date for the proposal is six to eight weeks after workshops; also, at the same time the RFP and application are posted on the OPI Web site.
- Proposals will be screened at the SEA level to ensure that the following legislatively mandated information is included: qualified personnel to develop, administer and implement an Even Start program, provide special training to prepare staff, as described and the plan of operation and continuous improvement for an Even Start program, as described in Section 1237 (a & b), and partnership between the LEA and a public or private nonprofit organization.

- During this time OPI will recruit and confirm the review panel, with the legislatively mandated three reviewers per panel (one early childhood educator, one adult basic educator and one individual with expertise in family literacy programs).
- Reviewers are sent a copy of the proposals (Montana usually receives between four to seven proposals), the review rating instrument, a RFP and blank application and travel instructions for a one or two day meeting.
- The review rating instrument transfers reviewers impressions of each proposal to a quantitative rating. Reviewers are asked to comment/question on each of the sections that would be relevant to explaining their rating.
- Upon completion of the panel and their recommendations, OPI staff will make award(s) to successful programs depending on the amount of funds to subgrant and the reviewer comments will be sent to the successful and unsuccessful communities.
- All successful applicants are informed in their award notification of the startup funds information.

The selection criteria and priorities are in section 1238 (a) are infused in the application and based on the recommendations of the review panelist. The selection criteria includes the likelihood of success in meeting the purpose of meeting the Even Start program and effectively implementing the 15 program elements. The applicants need to demonstrate need for the program in targeted area, including a survey that analyzes current services available to families. Collaborations with community agencies and partners are shown in firm agreements made in planning the program, including Head Start and Adult Basic Education. A full plan of implementation is needed; with discussion of relevant scientifically based reading research supporting the philosophy mode and practices is required in the application narrative. Applicants are required to provide evidence that all individuals who will provide academic instruction to children and adults have obtained the proper credentials. Plans for ensuring success and providing for a local evaluation are required to be addressed. Finally, applications that propose reasonable funding levels, identifying local contributions to provide quality programming, will receive more proposal points. The reviewers also look at which proposal(s) are most likely to be successful, have high percentages of low-income children and families most in need, provide services for at least a three age range, those that are cost effective and have adequate local share, those that will provide a model for new programs and those that are representative of the urban and rural regions.

After the reviewers rate the proposal categories, up to 10 additional points could be given to demographic areas that are most in need of Even Start services. Applicants who demonstrate that the area to be served has a high percentage or a large number of children and families who are in need of Even Start services as indicated by high levels of

poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, limited English proficiency, and or other need-related indicators as outlined in the statutory legislation.

2) Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C)

Prior to the preparation of the 2003 Local Operating Agencies' (LOA) summer project applications and continuing with the 2003-4 regular term, prospective subgrantees are to be informed of the requirements and features of the state's comprehensive service delivery plan and the state's comprehensive assessment program/performance targets with special emphasis on the unqualified obligation to provide appropriate instructional and support services to all highly mobile children with interrupted schooling who are also at risk of school failure on a priority basis. Each LOA application is thoroughly reviewed by SEA staff to ensure that it complies with all of the requirements of Public Law 107-110. Grants are awarded with the following priorities for service: It should be noted that all funding priorities used by the SEA to allocate funds to local operating agencies promote improved academic achievement, except those activities funded at the local level to comply with identification and recruitment requirements of the MEP. Even health risk factors, for example, can be directly related to a child's ability to achieve academically, and therefore are included in the priorities for services.

- a. Credit-deficient secondary migrant youth who are highly mobile, whose education has been disrupted during the current year, and who are at risk of school failure and who are not within the performance targets which will be established by the state in 2003 are given a first priority for service (first year mobility to be given a weighted risk factor of 1 for each student to be served--an additional risk factor of 1 is to be given to secondary, credit deficient secondary students);
- b. Other eligible migrant children who are highly mobile, whose education has been disrupted during the current year, and who are at risk of school failure are given a second priority for service (first year mobility elementary students who are not within the performance targets which will be established in 2003 will be given a weighted risk factor of 1; first year mobility elementary students not reading at grade level will be given an additional weighted risk factor of 1);
- c. Other eligible migrant children who are at risk of school failure and whose educations have been disrupted within the last two years are given a third priority for service;
- d. Other eligible migrant children who are at risk of school failure and whose educations have been disrupted within the last three years are given a fourth priority for service.

Other risk factors with a weighted factor of .5 are to be considered in allocating MEP funds to local operating agencies include the following list:

- 1) English Proficiency
- 2) Appropriate Grade/Age Placement
- 3) Special Education Placement
- 4) Health Needs

- 5) Social Service Needs
- 6) Availability of other Funds (such as Rotary Club for eyeglasses, etc., if other funds are not available, a .5 risk factor will be calculated)

Additionally, the SEA will allocate funds based on an LOA application, which provides the following information:

- 1) Needs of currently migrant children to be served,
- 2) Number of migrant children to be served,
- 3) Funds available for services to migrant children, and
- 4) Costs of services.

3) Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk – Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2)

- a. Timelines – The SEA will conduct a survey after November 1 and prior to January 1 each year to count neglected and delinquent children in local correctional facilities in Montana. The count will be held consistent with the guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Education. The numbers collected in the survey will be reported to U.S. Department of Education. Upon receipt of the preliminary allocation from U.S. Department of Education, the SEA will calculate an Average Number Per LEA. LEAs at or above the state average reported will be offered the ability to apply for a local grant. The SEA will provide grant funds on a per pupil basis to those eligible LEAs. After June 1, and upon receipt of the final allocation amounts from U.S. Department of Education the application will be sent to the eligible applicants indicating the amount of funds available to each eligible LEA. Applications will be due back to the SEA generally around August 1, each year. Grants will be reviewed and award notices will be given prior to the end of August.
- b. Selection Criteria – The selection criteria are based on providing services to facilities with larger numbers of delinquent children as indicated in Section 1422 (a). A more effective program can be created and quality service provided with a larger pool of funds than can be accomplished with a few dollars for a few children. A more effective program will promote improved academic achievement.
- c. Emphasis for grant approval will be placed on the use of funds for direct educational services, transition assistance and coordination, local LEA coordination, coordination with other state and federal programs, the use of qualified staff, and meeting high achievement standards. At the end of each year the SEA will review the Final Program Report and the program priorities of each applicant to assess student achievement. The SEA will provide technical assistance and make recommendations for applicants to address changes to improve academic achievement.

4) Title I, Part F-Comprehensive School Reform (CSR)

Each applicant for CSR funds must submit an application to the OPI that includes the 11 required components of a comprehensive school reform program. A comprehensive school reform program is one that:

- (1) employs proven strategies and proven methods for student learning, teaching, and school management that are based on scientifically based research and effective practices and have been replicated successfully in schools;
- (2) integrates a comprehensive design for effective school functioning, including instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, parental involvement, and school management, that aligns the school's curriculum, technology, and professional development into a comprehensive school reform plan for schoolwide change designed to enable all students to meet challenging State content and student academic achievement standards and addresses needs identified through a school needs assessment;
- (3) provides high quality and continuous teacher and staff professional development;
- (4) includes measurable goals for student academic achievement and benchmarks for meeting such goals;
- (5) is supported by teachers, principals, administrators, school personnel staff, and other professional staff;
- (6) provides support for teachers, principals, administrators, and other school staff;
- (7) provides for the meaningful involvement of parents and the local community in planning, implementing, and evaluating school improvement activities consistent with section 1118 (parent involvement);
- (8) uses high quality external technical support and assistance from an entity that has experience and expertise in schoolwide reform and improvement, which may include an institution of higher education;
- (9) includes a plan for the annual evaluation of the implementation of school reforms and the student results achieved;
- (10) identifies other resources, including Federal, State, local, and private resources, that shall be used to coordinate services that will support and sustain the comprehensive school reform effort; and
- (11) has been found, through scientifically based research to significantly improve the academic achievement of students participating in such programs as compared to students in schools who have not participated in such program; or has been found to have strong evidence that such programs will significantly improve the academic achievement of participating children.

Each application is scored by three members of a field review panel and must receive an average score of 70 percent of the maximum allowable points before

consideration for funding by the OPI. A copy of the application form is included as an Attachment. A copy of the scoring rubric used by members of the field review panel is included as an attachment.

5) Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting – subgrants to eligible partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3).

a. timelines

The Montana Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education (OCHE) will convene its advisory panel in August 2002 to refine selection criteria and priorities, design the RFP and the proposal evaluation rubric. The advisory panel will include representatives from OPI, the Board of Public Education, the Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council, high-need LEAs, arts and sciences and teacher education programs in the eight relevant Higher Education Agencies (HEAs). A subgroup of this panel will be convened to review the proposals and make final funding recommendations to OCHE.

OCHE will publish and observe the following schedule.

- Let the RFP in September with a return deadline of October 30.
- Circulate proposals and the evaluation rubric to the review panel by November 8.
- Convene review panel to complete review, week of November 18.
- Announce awards December 2, 2002.

b. selection criteria

The selection criteria are based on increasing students' academic achievement by improving teacher and principal quality and increasing the number of highly qualified teachers. This means upgrading teachers' preparation so that they can meet State certification/endorsement standards in content areas in which they teach.

In FY00, the Montana Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education focused the Title II Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development grants on high-need LEAs. Grant criteria included:

- i. professional development program based on the Montana content standards and benchmarks in mathematics, science and/or reading;
- ii. research-based techniques for teaching effectively low-performing middle school students from low-performing, low-income middle schools [defined by Gear Up eligibility criteria]; and
- iii. where students typically performed below "proficient" in reading and language arts, mathematics and science in standardized testing.

OCHE will adapt these criteria to Title II, Part A with an advisory panel of members noted above. At the time OCHE and OPI partnered to deliver the Montana State Gear Up project to LEAs, we identified 60 Montana middle schools that met the Gear Up eligibility criterion of more than 50 percent of students on the free or reduced lunch

program. These schools have many teachers **not** endorsed in the subject matter they teach and a majority of students performing below grade level in those same subjects. The majority of the schools in this group have also been identified for improvement under Title I.

c. priorities

Priority is accorded to reading/language arts and mathematics (Sections 2101 (1) and 2102 (3)).

i. Increase teacher/principal content knowledge and enhance instructional practices in 5th-8th grade reading and language arts.

ii. Increase teacher/principal content knowledge and enhance instructional practices in 5th-8th grade Geometry (Montana Mathematics Standard 4).

iii. Increase teacher/principal content knowledge and enhance instructional practices in 5th-8th and/or 9th-12th grade Functions and Algebra (Montana Mathematics Standards 7 and 3).

iv. Increase teacher/principal content knowledge and enhance instructional practices in teaching students to select, read, and respond to print and non-print materials for a variety of purposes and gather, analyze, synthesize, evaluate and communicate their findings in appropriate ways (Montana Reading Standards 4 and 5).

According to the Department's report (June 2002) and Secretary Paige, to raise academic standards will require that prospective teachers pass rigorous exams in the subjects they plan to teach. Research shows that teachers with strong academic backgrounds in specific content areas are more likely to boost the academic performance of their students in those subjects.

6.) Title II, Part D-Enhancing Education Through Technology

The Montana Office of Public Instruction's (OPI), long-term strategies for improving student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through the effective use of technology in the classroom and the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction include the following:

1. The OPI is currently completing the draft of the Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan required of all districts by the Montana Board of Public Education. This plan must, through a data-driven approach, reflect the student academic achievement targets, teacher professional development needs, and curriculum and instruction needs of the district including the effective use of technology for instruction and student learning,

2. The OPI has completed, through the use of district-level consultants, Standards Integration Charts that illustrate how the various Montana Content and Performance Standards overlap. These charts are available on the OPI Web site and are actively promoted state-wide as a technology integration tool,
3. The OPI disperses technology funding for Montana schools. Funding is dependent upon the harvest of timber on state lands. The timber harvest must exceed 18 million board feet in one year before funds are generated. Typically, funding is provided to school districts every other year. Districts may now run a mill levy to fund technology. The enabling legislation creates a "Technology Depreciation Fund" at the local level when the levy is passed by the voters. All revenues for technology are budgeted and accounted for locally but must address local needs as they relate to state and federal requirements for professional development, student and teacher literacy, and improvement of student academic achievement, and
4. The Office of Public Instruction state technology plan goals and measurable objectives, utilized directly in the formula and the competitive funding programs, target student achievement on state standards, technology literacy for students and teachers.

Goal No. 1

Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction: All Montana teachers will be effective and efficient integrators of technology into their curriculum and teaching.

Measurable Objective 1.1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Teachers' Technology Use in Teaching and Learning section of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by spring 2007.

Goal No. 2

Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction: All Montana teachers will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standards for students.

Measurable Objective 2.1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of Montana teachers K-12 will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standard 3—Students

use a variety of technologies for Communication--by spring 2007 as measured by the Montana Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study.

Measurable Objective 2.2: Eighty-five percent (85%) of Montana teachers K-12 will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standard 6--Students apply technological abilities and knowledge to construct new personal understanding--by spring 2007 as measured by the Montana Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study, standard 6 subsection.

Measurable Objective 2.3: Eighty-five percent (85%) of Montana teachers K-12 will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standard 2 --Students use a variety of Technologies to Enhance Productivity -by Spring 2007 as measured by the Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study, standard 2 subsection.

Goal No. 3

Increasing the Ability of Teachers to Teach: All Montana teachers and principals will be technologically proficient.

Measurable Objective 3.1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Teachers' Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2007.

1.1 Goal No. 4

Enabling Students to meet challenging State standards: All Montana students will be technologically proficient by eighth grade.

Measurable Objective 4.1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of students will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Students' Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by spring 2007.

5. Title II, Part D formula funding has targeted three of the Montana Content and Performance Standards for Technology through district-level measurable objectives aimed at increasing teachers' ability to teach utilizing technology through increasing their understanding of the standards and their abilities to teach them. The standards were identified as areas of need via the Montana Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study

conducted during the 2000-2001 school year. The self-assessment identified the teacher comfort with the standards and benchmarks for technology. Utilizing that information, the OPI is targeting the three standards that were of most concern to Montana teachers. Standards 3 – Students use a variety of technologies for communication, 6 – Students apply technological abilities and knowledge to construct new personal understanding, and Standard 2 -- Students use a variety of technologies to enhance productivity (see measurable objectives 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3),

6. Title II, Part D formula funding has targeted technology integration (increasing the ability of teachers to teach) and student technology proficiencies (enabling students to meet challenging state standards) through district-level measurable objectives (1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, and 4.1),
7. Title II, Part D competitive funding will target the same three content and performance standards as well as the technology integration and student proficiencies through district level measurable objectives (1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, and 4.1), and
8. The OPI federal programs staff is quite small which encourages and enables cross-program coordination. Program staff meet on a regular basis to explore the common program goals and regularly work together on relevant projects.

Key activities that the OPI will conduct or sponsor with the funds it retains at the state level include the following:

1. Collaboration with the Northwest Educational Technology Consortium (NETC) at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL), in Portland, Oregon to provide regional technical assistance to districts on program evaluation related issues in addition to their ongoing work on technology related issues in Montana,
2. Provide technical assistance to targeted districts for the formula and competitive applications for Title II, Part D funding,
3. Provide the Montana Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development study survey instrument (online) for funded districts to utilize for baseline and follow-up data to document progress toward the measurable objectives,
4. Continue the development of partnerships with state level technology groups and service providers such as the Burn's Telecommunications Center at the Montana State University in Bozeman, Montana, the three PT3 grants located at universities in Montana, the Montana Small Schools Alliance, and the Bill Gates Leadership grant, and

5. Implementing the formula and competitive grant funded programs for targeted districts utilizing district level individuals on teams to design, implement and evaluate proposals and program outcomes.

Descriptions of how the SEA will ensure that students and teachers, particularly those in the schools of high-need LEAs, have increased access to technology, and how the SEA will coordinate the application and award process for state funds under this part include:

1. Targeting funds to high-need LEA's as per guidance (high poverty, low-performing and high technology need), utilizing appropriate district-level data,
2. Providing technical assistance to targeted districts for the formula and competitive applications for Title II, Part D funding on program requirements, program development and implementation and evaluation issues, and
3. Implementing the formula and competitive grant funded program for targeted districts utilizing district level individuals on teams to design, implement and evaluate proposals and program outcomes.

Descriptions of key procedures, selection criteria, and priorities the state will use to award competitive subgrants under Title II, Part D include:

1. Competitive grants will focus upon measurable objectives (state priorities) targeting integration of technology into curriculum and instruction, increasing the ability of teachers to teach utilizing technology, and enabling students to meet challenging state standards,
2. Competitive grants will be targeted to high-need LEA's as per guidance (high poverty, low-performing and high technology need), utilizing appropriate district level data, also taking into account effective partnerships that can be created to ensure effective integration and the use of proven teaching practices,
3. District level technology plans will be submitted as a part of the application process to ensure that required elements are included and that the technology vision is consistent with best practices and funding requirements,
4. Districts that receive a formula level award that is not of sufficient size to be effective will be given priority in the competitive funding process, and
5. Grants will be designed to ensure for sufficient size and scope (multi-year) to allow for the effective and efficient accomplishment of the required objectives.

Performance Indicator 1.5: The percentage of students that meet or exceed State standards for student literacy in technology.

State Performance Target	Baseline Data	
Eighty-five percent (85%) of students will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Students' Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking a Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) (or equivalent measure) by spring 2007.	To be collected fall 2002.	
Performance Indicator 4.3: The percentage of teachers qualified to use technology for instruction.		
State Performance Target	Baseline Data	
4.3.1 Eighty-five percent (85%) of teachers will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Teachers' Technology Use in Teaching and Learning section of the Taking a Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) (or equivalent measure) by spring 2007.	To be collected fall 2002.	
Performance Indicator 5.5: The number of schools in which all students are able to work from a networked computer.		
State Performance Target	Baseline Data	
5.5.1 One hundred percent (100%) of students in Montana school districts will be able to work from a networked computer as measured by the TAGLIT survey data by spring 2007.		

Description of State goals and alignment of technology goals.

1. All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014.
2. All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English.
3. By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
4. All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

5. All students will graduate from high school.

The Office of Public Instruction's goals for instructional technology focus upon **Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction, Increasing the Ability of Teachers to Teach, and Enabling Students to meet challenging State standards.** The three areas encompass the five state goals and provide underlying support for their accomplishment. Technology is a tool to be used transparently in teaching and learning that enhances the learning and motivation to learn. Through the focus upon enhancing teacher's abilities to teach with technology utilizing basic technology skills as well as content specific technology applications appropriate to the content areas, teacher quality and thus, instruction is improved. By focusing upon the technology content standards, and technology use in the context of the content areas through the related standards, student's abilities to meet State standards will be enhanced, as well as their motivation to learn. All of these areas work to create appealing and supportive learning environments ultimately leading to increased student satisfaction and increased graduation rates.

- 7) Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities – reservation for the governor (Title IV, Part A, section 4112):

- a) timelines

The Montana Board of Crime Control process of awarding funds is initiated with the issuance of a Request for Proposals in March of each year. The program specialist screens all applications for eligibility criteria and makes recommendations to the Subgrant Review Committee (the Subgrant Review Committee consists of five members and two alternates from the Board of Crime Control). The Committee reviews, discusses, and votes on the grant proposals in June of each year. Their recommendations move forward as a seconded-motion to the full Board. The Board of Crime Control makes the final decision on the grants during their regularly scheduled June meeting with award effective for the July-June project year.

Monitoring is accomplished through quarterly financial and narrative reports. The narrative reports describe performance indicators that reflect the objectives of the Act. On-site monitoring is conducted with no less than 30 percent of the programs each year. The monitoring visits address compliance with the Act, activities, and management of the program.

Technical assistance will be provided during site visits, through telephone, mail and electronic communications, and regional workshops. Updates and new information will be mailed when necessary and within the quarterly report process.

- b) selection criteria

The Montana Chief Executive has designated the Montana Board of Crime Control (MBCC) as the administrative agency responsible for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities funds. MBCC issues competitive Request for Proposals

for Title IV Part A funds. Public notification is provided through the agency Web site and direct mail to schools, community and faith-based organizations. The agency program specialist reviews all applications for eligibility criteria as described by the federal Act; the budget specialist reviews for compliance with OMB and state fiscal criteria. Initial recommendations regarding funding appropriateness is made by staff to a review committee of the Board of Crime Control (a gubernatorial appointed board charged with conducting and administering criminal justice planning for Montana). The Committee reviews, discusses, and votes on the grant proposals. Their recommendations are referred to the Board of Crime Control, which makes final grant award decisions.

c) priorities

Projects are selected based on quality of the proposal, operational strength of the applicant, geographic distribution, other available resources, responsiveness to the RFP, and relationship to the overall mission and strategic plan of the MBCC.

7) Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, Section 4126)

a) timelines

A joint invitation from OPI and MBCC will be issued prior to August 2002 to announce availability of funds and invite applications. Applications will be distributed to eligible applicants: LEAs, community-based organizations and public and private non-profit entities. The existing community service projects will be an audience for the program announcement.

Sub-contracts will be awarded by September 2002 for a 12-month contractual period. Projects will be required to provide project activity reports on a schedule and prescribed format as determined by OPI. Contract monitoring will be provided by OPI Safe and Drug Free School staff; technical assistance will be provided by MBCC and OPI staff, according to the type of assistance required and the particular expertise of staff required.

b) selection criteria

A joint OPI/MBCC review panel will select the most competitive applications for sub-contract through OPI. Selection will be determined based on: high degree of program sustainability as evidenced by existing or promising community service infrastructure; documentation of cooperative agreement between the school district, justice department, law enforcement and program site; overall quality of program proposal; and description of allowable program activities as allowed by the Act.

c) priorities

The Office of Public Instruction will develop a partnership with the Montana Board of Crime Control (MBCC) to integrate and enhance the Community Service program into existing community-based programs. The MBCC is the state justice-planning agency that administers the governor's Safe and Drug-Free

Schools and Community Funds and other U.S. Department of Justice pass-through funds currently supporting similar programs within the state.

8) 21st Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)

Montana has made policy decisions regarding administration based on analysis of the federal requirements and determination of the best course of action for all of Montana schools. The following table details the specific criteria:

MONTANA'S OPI POLICY: STATE ADMINISTRATION OF THE 21ST CCLC

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
Title	21 st Century Community Learning Center Program	Montana 21 st Century Community Learning Center Program
Funding stream	Formula grants are provided to states with competitive subgrants to be offered at the local level.	A competitive grant process will be administered by OPI.
Eligible Grantees	<p>Eligible entities are LEAs, CBOs, another public or private entity, or a consortium of 2 or more of such agencies, organizations, or entities. This eligibility includes cities and counties.</p> <p>No agency or organization may be excluded from applying. States may establish priorities and may set requirements of the program that every applicant must meet.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applications from agencies and organizations other than an LEA, city or county will be screened for capacity to administer the program. - Applications must include a clear and documented plan of communication and linkage with the school district and school site.
	<p>School districts that have received 21st CCLC awards that have ended, or are ending this year, may apply for funds to continue those programs. The supplanting provision does not prohibit Federal funds from being used to continue programs where a previous Federal grant has ended.</p>	<p>21st CCLC grantees that have programs that have completed their grant period will be screened for capacity to administer the program as demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - achievement of goals set - evidence of that achievement <p>Documentation must include the most current federal program report indicating goals, objectives and performance indicators.</p> <p>21st CCLC grantees that are ending this year and current 21st CCLC will be eligible for additional funding to build</p>

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
		<p>a new program with new schools/site. These applications will be screened for capacity to administer the program as demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - achievement of goals set - evidence of that achievement - attendance in the 2001-2002 year
Site Eligibility	<p>Before states may approve applications for a program to be located at facilities other than elementary or secondary schools, the application must show that: a) it will be at least as available to students the program is serving; and b) as accessible as the program would be if it were located at a school.</p>	<p>Applications proposing to provide services through the 21st CCLC grant program at a non-school site must provide documentation that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the program will be at least as available and accessible as it would be at the school site - the school district and school site are in agreement on the alternate site - there is a clearly defined plan of communication between the alternate site and the school, including the alignment of the education and literacy component, student academic evaluations, attendance during the regular school day, and other indicators described below - safe transportation between the school and the alternate site will be provided. <p>Additional funding for transportation can be requested if there is a justifiable need.</p>
Priority of Funding	<p>The SEA will make awards only to eligible entities that propose to serve:</p> <p>1) students who primarily attend a) schools eligible for schoolwide programs (Title I)</p>	<p>Montana will restrict grant awards to only those applications that propose to primarily serve students that attend schools that are eligible as Title I schoolwide programs or where at least 40% of the students qualify to receive free or reduced-cost meals.</p>

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
	<p>b) schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families and</p> <p>2) the families of those students</p> <p>States are required to make awards only to applicants that will primarily serve students that attend schools with a high concentration of poor students. States cannot give a grant unless it is to serve students eligible for Title I schoolwide programs (at least 40% of the students qualify to receive free or reduced-cost meals).</p> <p>States must give priority to applications that will serve children in schools designated in need of improvement under Title I (Section 1116) and that are submitted jointly by school districts and community-based organizations.</p>	<p>Montana will give competitive priority to applications that propose to serve children and youth in schools designated in need of improvement under Title I and that are submitted jointly by school districts and community-based organizations. Priority will be provided through 5 additional points on a 100-point scale, assigned at review.</p>
Uses of Funds	<p>The purpose is to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities in community learning centers that</p> <p>1) Provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet State and local student academic achievement standards in core academic subjects, such as reading and mathematics</p> <p>2) offer students a broad array of additional services and programs and activities such as:</p> <p>a. youth development</p>	<p>Montana will require applicants to provide both opportunities for academic enrichment and a broad array of additional services to reinforce and complement the academic program. Applicants must offer an array of additional services, programs, and activities including those specified and other learning support opportunities such as service-learning, mentoring, etc.</p> <p>Montana will require grantees to offer opportunities for literacy services to family members if there is an identified need in the community and if there are no other avenues for filling that need through coordination with other State</p>

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
	<p>b. drug and violence prevention programs</p> <p>c. art, music and recreation programs</p> <p>d. technology education</p> <p>e. character education</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students</p> <p>3) offer families of students served opportunities for literacy and related educational development</p>	<p>and federal programs (e.g., Even Start, Healthy Start, etc.).</p>
<p>Local Competitive Grants</p>	<p>Applications must include descriptions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - before and after school or summer recess activities to be funded; - how students will travel safely to and from the center; and home; - how the organization will disseminate information about the center (including its location) to the community in a manner that is understandable and accessible - how the activities are expected to improve student academic performance; - Federal, State, and local programs that will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public resources; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how the program will meet the following principles of effectiveness by being based on: 	<p>EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demonstration that the program was developed with and will be carried out in active collaboration with the schools the students attend, including documented support and accountability by the principal as well as the district. - demonstration of experience or promise of success in providing activities that complement and enhance the academic performance of the students - documentation of how activities planned are expected to improve student academic performance - description of how the activities will meet the principles of effectiveness by being based on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ an established set of

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ an assessment of objective data regarding need for the before and after school programs (including summer recess periods) and activities in the schools and communities ▶ an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment opportunities; and ▶ if appropriate, scientifically based research that provides evidence that the program or activity will help students meet State and local student academic achievement standards; - the partnership between the local educational agency, a community-based organization, and another public or private organization (if appropriate); - an evaluation of the community needs and resources for the program and how the program will address those needs (including the needs of working families); - the eligible organization's experience, or promise of success, in providing educational and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement, and positive youth development of students; and - how the applicant will use qualified senior volunteers, if the applicant plans to do so. 	<p>performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment opportunities; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ scientifically based research that provides evidence that the program or activity will help students meet State and local student academic achievement standards, if appropriate. <p style="text-align: center;">COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identification of Federal, State, and local programs that will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public resources - description of the development and plans for the ongoing maintenance of a partnership between the local educational agency, a community-based organization, and another public or private organization (if appropriate) to support the implementation of the proposed program - a description of the plan for continuing the program beyond grant funding <p style="text-align: center;">PROGRAM MANAGEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an assessment of objective data

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
		<p>regarding need for an after school or a before and after school program (including summer recess periods), current community resources, and how the proposed program will address those needs (including the needs of working families)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a description of the before and/or after school and/or summer activities to be provided - an assurance that the program will take place in a safe and easily accessible facility - description of how the applicant will disseminate information about the program to the community in a manner that is understandable and accessible
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - documentation of the experience, or promise of success by the applicant partners, in providing educational and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement, and positive youth development of students - description of staff recruitment, training development and retention strategies - description of how qualified senior volunteers will be used, if the applicant plans to do so. - If activities are offered off school site, a description of how students will travel safely to and from the program and home.

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
	<p>Further, each application must contain assurances that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the program will take place in a safe and easily accessible facility; - the program was developed and will be carried out in active collaboration with the schools the students attend - the program will primarily target students who attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs - funds will be used to increase the level of state, local, and other non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of these Federal funds, be available for authorized programs and activities, and will not supplant other Federal, State, local, or non-Federal funds; and - The community was given notice of an intent to submit an application and public availability of any waiver request of the application after submission. 	<p>Effective Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demonstration of the capacity of the applicant to provide all requested evaluation data - description of the evaluation of program effectiveness that the applicant will design - documentation that evaluation results will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program - assurance that the applicant can effectively make the evaluation results available to the public - commitment of adequate resources for the evaluation component <p>Assurances signed by the superintendent of the participating school district and by the authorized representative of the agency (if different) submitting the application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - assurance that the program will primarily target students who attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs - assurance that the program funds will be used to supplement and not supplant other funds - assurance that the community was given notice of an intent to submit an application and that any waiver request of the application will be publicly available after submission. - assurance that the schools and districts participating will share data required by the evaluation component with the applicant.

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
Award Duration	<p>The SEA will make awards for programs for a period of not less than 3 years and not more than five years and</p> <p>Local applicants are required to submit a plan describing how the program will continue after funding ends.</p>	<p>Montana will offer a five-year maximum grant period based on availability of funds and satisfactory performance. Annual re-application is required; the annual application must document progress toward meeting the objectives, program adjustments and performance indicators.</p>
Required Matching Funds	<p>The SEA may require matching funds, however these funds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) may not exceed the amount of the grant award, and 2) may not be derived from other State or Federal funds <p>The match amount may be based on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a sliding scale relative to the poverty of the population to be served - the ability of the applicant to obtain such funds <p>In-kind contributions shall be permitted to be used as all or part of the required match.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matching funds cannot be used as a factor in determining grant awards - The amount of match must be low enough for any applicant to meet it (5 percent or so) and so will not disfavor any applicant. - Any requirement for matching funds must be able to be waived if 	<p>Montana will not require matching funds.</p>

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
	documentation of need for such is provided.	
Minimum Award	<p>\$50,000</p> <p>States are required to ensure that awards are sufficient in size and scope to support high-quality, effective programs. States are encouraged to award fewer but more substantial awards – that are large enough to fully implement comprehensive plans described in successful applications – rather than a larger number of small awards unlikely to have any measurable impact on student achievement. Regardless of the size of the grant, proposed costs must be reasonable and necessary to carry out the program's purposes and objectives.</p>	<p>Minimum grant awards will be \$50,000 per project. Although a maximum award is not prescribed, budgets must be defensible and reasonable.</p>
Scope	<p>Services must be offered during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session, including before school, after school, evenings, and weekends.</p>	<p>Definition: A community learning center offers academic, artistic, and cultural enrichment opportunities to students and their families when school is not in session (before school, after school, or during holidays or summer recess). A community-learning center assists students in meeting State and local academic achievement standards in core academic subjects, such as reading and mathematics, by providing the students with opportunities for academic enrichment. Centers also provide students with a broad array of other activities – such as drug and violence prevention, counseling, art, music, recreation, technology, and character education programs – during periods when school is not in session. Community learning centers must also serve the families of participating students, e.g., through family literacy</p>

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
		<p>programs.</p> <p>Montana will require 21st Century Community Learning Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to operate after school programs at least three hours per day, beginning when school dismisses, and - no less than three days per week during the typical school year, and - to offer a daily, nutritious snack that meets the requirements of the USDA National School Lunch Program for meal supplements. <p>Montana will require that 21st Century Community Learning Centers proposing to provide both an after school and a before school program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - operate the before school program at least one hour per day ending just before school begins, and - no less than three days a week during the typical school year, and - offer a daily, nutritious breakfast that meets the requirements of the USDA School Breakfast Program. <p>Montana 21st Century Community Learning Centers programs that operate on Saturday or non-school days will be required to operate either three or four hours dependent on amount requested for core funding and to offer a daily nutritious breakfast and/or snack that meets the USDA requirements specified above.</p> <p>The local collaborative partners will</p>

	Federal Non-regulatory Guidance	State Implementation
		determine attendance patterns. Based on experience and research, Montana will recommend that programs require elementary student attendance every day and middle school/high school attendance at least three days per week of the five-day program.
Account-ability	<p>Local programs must indicate how they meet the principles of effectiveness. Programs must be based upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school programs (including summer school programs) and activities in schools and communities - an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring quality academic enrichment opportunities; - if appropriate, scientifically based research that provides evidence that the program will help students meet the State and local academic achievement standards. 	<p>Montana will require 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program grantees to submit annual outcome based data for evaluation, including measures for academic performance, attendance, and positive behavioral changes including, but not limited to the following: Student level data from the annual standardized testing and reporting program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - student level data regarding the attendance and enrollment in the regular school day program and in the after school or the before and after school program (including Saturday, summer, and holiday attendance). - student level data on referrals, suspensions, and school safety. - School and program level data from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). - Qualitative data describing the program including operational changes, staffing, and a discussion of how the program is meeting its objectives as stated in the application. - Performance goals and corresponding indicators are reflected within the application and coincide with the five ESEA goals adopted by OPI.

S:\DRUGFREE\MONTANA 21st Century Policy.doc

a) timelines

The request for applications will be published on the Web site and mailed to the pool of eligible entities in July 2002. Applications will be due to the Office of Public Instruction on September 20, 2002. The Peer Review team will complete their review and recommendation process by October 7, 2002. Awards will be made October 15, 2002.

b) selection criteria and c) priorities

The application package will be distributed to schools, governmental, community and faith-based organizations, noticed through no fewer than five major daily newspapers and posted on the OPI Web site. State implementation will include compliance with all assurances and criteria as provided in Title IV Part B, which will be articulated to potential applicants through the application package.

Montana will enlist a peer review process, enlisting panels of reviewers from related state agencies, existing after school project staff, LEA staff, and SEA staff. Critical components on which applications will be rated include: education and enrichment, collaboration and partnerships, program management, and effective evaluation. A scoring rubric has been developed for use by the review panels; the rubric will be included within the descriptive portion of the application package to assure applicant knowledge of the process.

The DRAFT application for funding of competitive 21st Century Community Learning Centers is attached in the Appendix.

3. How will Montana monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools and other subgrantees?

The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) will conduct monitoring and provide professional development and technical assistance in a variety of ways. The OPI has an Internet Web site (www.opi.state.mt.us) that hosts information regarding federal programs (Federal Programs). This site contains a wide variety of information including program applications, required assurances, program information and updates. In addition, each program has its own site for additional, program specific, information. All materials and information developed at the OPI is posted on this Web site. In addition, the front page of the site has a "News Headlines" section where new federal program information is posted. The Web site has a section where frequently asked questions (FAQs) are answered and posted for all. Finally, the Web site has links to other appropriate sites, such as the U.S. Department of Education Web site.

The OPI has developed an official e-mail system that provides e-mail messages to the authorized representatives of all federal programs, in addition to all county superintendents. The e-mail system is used to provide updates concerning requirements of federal programs, as well as information concerning regional and statewide technical assistance opportunities.

OPI staff serve as liaisons to the regional monthly meetings of the Montana Association of School Superintendents (MASS). The office produces a monthly OPI Activity Notes Newsletter that is distributed and discussed at each of the nine regional MASS meetings each month.

Monitoring includes both fiscal and program components. Fiscal monitoring is accomplished through routine, ongoing fiscal program oversight by both fiscal and program staff. There is also a “final fiscal report” as well as state and federal auditing requirements. Program monitoring is accomplished formally through onsite reviews and “final program reports,” and informally through conferences, meetings and telephone and electronic communication. Districts identified as “high risk” through auditing and monitoring reports are required to provide additional fiscal and program reports and often on-site visits are conducted to provide technical assistance and oversight.

Technical assistance is provided in a wide variety of ways. Pre-application interactive video (METNET) sessions are conducted throughout the state as well as several regional, face-to-face workshops. These sessions provide participants with information regarding grant opportunities, completion requirements of the application, common and program-specific assurances and “best practices” based upon scientific research for each program. Program staff are available by telephone, electronically or on-site to answer questions resulting from the workshops. Additionally, questions asked during either the interactive teleconference or regional workshops are answered and posted on the OPI Web site.

During the course of the school year, technical assistance is provided through state conferences, regional meetings, program-specific workshops, written materials as well as by telephone or electronic means. Many ESEA programs work collaboratively with other SEA divisions such as Special Education, Career, Technical and Adult Education or Health Enhancement in providing coordinated, collaborative professional development.

The OPI plans to continue the practice of providing subgrantees with information regarding the identification and implementation of effective instructional programs and practices based on educational research by posting information on its Web site, direct mailings and professional development that includes such information. It will also require subgrantees to identify such practices in its reporting system to the OPI.

4. The statewide system of support under Section 1117 will consist of information, support, and technical assistance to schools and districts identified for improvement and corrective action. This system will depend on the LEAs utilizing the funds they will receive (95% from the set aside for school improvement) following guidance, recommendations, and requirements given them by the SEA. Since the funding at the SEA level for this purpose has been statutorily reduced from \$200,000 to \$34,290, the level of support, materials, and resources provided directly (paid for) by the SEA cannot be as extensive as in the past. However, formation of school support teams consisting of distinguished teachers and principals will be conducted by the SEA with costs for the assistance from such teams to be borne by the LEAs from the funds allocated to them for this purpose. Arrangements with individuals from institutions of higher education will be

brokered and offered to LEAs as well to be funded with the additional improvement funds the LEAs receive. Private providers of scientifically based technical assistance may also be utilized by the LEAs. Some form of external assistance must be selected and utilized by the LEAs under this system.

5.
 - a. The SEA will continue to provide assistance to schools to make effective use of schoolwide programs through written materials, regional workshops and teleconferences. The SEA will utilize one of the methods demonstrated to be effective by Texas, New Jersey, and South Carolina to set up procedures to eliminate any fiscal and accounting barriers so that schools can easily consolidate federal, State, and local funds for schoolwide programs. The work of gathering the exact information from those states mentioned and other ideas is underway and procedures will be in place by the fall of the 2002-2003 school year.
 - b. The SEA will continue to work on establishing regional professional development academies or centers so that all teachers, particularly those in high-poverty areas and those in schools in need of improvement, are highly qualified. Help the SEA will provide includes:
 - i. Conducting effective professional development activities through the academies or regional centers, as well as at various teleconferences, conferences and workshops, with opportunities for follow-up to provide a sustained effort that is not short term;
 - ii. Encouraging and assisting in the recruitment of highly qualified teachers by publicizing alternative routes to certification or licensure and informing districts of options to utilize signing bonuses or other incentives;
 - iii. Supporting schools and districts in obtaining, analyzing, and utilizing data for informed decision-making and focused professional development to improve accountability systems, comprehensive planning, and professional development.
 - iv. Working with the 2003 Montana Legislature to provide adequate funding to public schools, including funds necessary to pay competitive salaries that discourage teachers from leaving the state for higher salaries elsewhere.
 - c. The SEA will continue to inform districts of the qualifications necessary for paraprofessionals stated in Sections 1119(c) and (d) and will continue to offer suggestions to districts about possible tests and other ideas to enable individuals to obtain the qualifications by the 2005-2006 school

year. The SEA is partnering in two efforts so far, one with Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory and one with the University of Montana's Rural Institute on Disabilities, to bring high quality training opportunities to those seeking to obtain these qualifications. Discussions have also been held with Miles City Community College about a certificate program they are planning to offer to help individuals obtain the necessary qualifications. The SEA will provide information to districts about all these options and others as they become available.

- d. The SEA will promote, encourage, and facilitate actions to help LEAs with a high need for technology, high percentages or numbers of children in poverty, and low-performing schools form partnerships with other LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs), libraries, and other private and public for-profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise to improve the use of technology in instruction. Such entities will be sought out by the SEA so that brokering of partnerships and services can take place. The LEAs will be contacted and brought into the brokering of partnerships that are appropriate and most useful for them.
- e. The SEA will promote parental and community participation in schools by working with the Montana Parent Information Center and the Montana Chamber of Commerce. Activities will reach out to parents, community, and business partners to help them be more active in the schools statewide. Publications and communications will be distributed that promote the interaction and support of all these groups so that schools can be successful for all children.
- f. The SEA will receive (week of June 3, 2002) a flat file of the 2001-2002 assessment data from MontCAS Phase 1, The Iowa Tests, for grades 4, 8, and 11 in reading and mathematics. This data will form the baseline data for the core ESEA accountability system described in Part I. The follow-up data will be received in the same manner in June 2003 for the school year 2002-2003. Beyond those years data will be obtained from the new CRT's in reading in math for grades 3-8 and grade 11 by June 2006 and in science for grades 4, 8, and 11 by June 2008.

6. Describe how Montana:

- a) consulted with the Governor's office:
OPI personnel developed the draft SEA Consolidated Application and consulted with the Governor's office staff regarding the scope of the application, goals, indicators, program requirements, and timelines. Following consultation, necessary modifications were made prior to submission.
- b) how ESEA will be coordinated with State-level activities:

Coordination of ESEA programs has already taken place and will continue. An ESEA steering committee, led by the two assistant superintendents of the Education Services Department and composed of three division administrators who lead the divisions that contain ESEA programs, meet regularly to strategize the coordination of state-level activities, plan timelines for compliance, and to address the goals of the ESEA programs. In addition, the assistant superintendents convene monthly meetings with all of the division administrators of the department to assure regular communication and coordination with all state and federally funded programs. Since the two assistant superintendents are members of the state superintendent's leadership cabinet, coordination is addressed in the policies developed and implemented by the Superintendent's Cabinet. ESEA Coordination is a standing item on the agendas of the Superintendent's Cabinet agenda.

The development of a statewide assessment program for all staff requires the collaboration of at least four Divisions within the office. An assessment team leads the assessment efforts and assures coordination of state and federal assessment requirements. The directors of all state and federal programs are part of the assessment committee, with the Title I Director and the Assessment Director leading the efforts of the Assessment team.

Regional workshops have already addressed the integration of the ESEA LEA Plan with the Special Education and Perkins LEA plans as well as with the state required Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan. The regional workshops were planned and delivered by administrators and staff of all federal and state programs.

This model will be used to direct future work. The SEA will continue to actively coordinate the integration of the ESEA LEA plans and the state required Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan. This is an ongoing effort.

OPI staff are part of the Montana Education Forum, a policy group composed of leaders of state organizations such as the Montana School Board Association, Montana Rural Education Association, School Administrators of Montana. The Montana Education Forum discusses coordination of federal and state programs. OPI staff presented information from the newly reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act and members of the forum discussed coordination and collaboration roles and policies of their member groups that will enhance the coordination of ESEA programs.

c) how SEA officials will coordinate with other organizations:

Program staff will continue to coordinate with other organizations through the OPI Web site, public meetings, conferences and workshops, and, where organizations other than LEAs are eligible subgrantees, advertise information through the media (newspapers), statewide organizations (faith-based groups, alternative schools,

juvenile delinquency/at-risk programs) and routine Request for Proposal (RFP) procedures.

d) how the SEA will coordinate with the other state agencies:

The OPI has a long history of collaboration with other state agencies including the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education (administrator of the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act), the Montana Board of Crime Control (administrator of the Governor's portion of the SDFSC program and Youth Justice Council), the Office of the Attorney General (coordinator of the statewide Drug and Alcohol Task Force), and the Department of Health and Human Services (administrator of IDEA Part C, Head Start and others). The OPI has program staff on coordinating task forces, committees or councils with each of these agencies that deal with ensuring that all state efforts are efficient, effective and well planned and that a rural state like Montana with limited resources can meet the requirements and expectations of each of the programs it administers. Some examples of coordination with other government agencies include the service of OPI administrators and program staff on task forces and commissions for workforce development, community service and literacy development.

7. What strategies will Montana use to determine, on a regular basis, whether LEAs, schools and other subgrantees are making satisfactory progress?

To determine, on a regular basis, whether LEAs, schools and other subgrantees are making satisfactory progress in meeting State and local goals and desired outcomes, each program will collect data as required through regular and final program reports, other documentation and on-site reviews.

For goal number 1, the percent of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts and mathematics, the SEA will work with the state assessment contractor to obtain the necessary information for each school and LEA. See the attached OPI Compliance Agreement with the U.S. Department of Education for processes and timelines.

For goal number 2, the percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year, the percentage who are at the proficient level in reading/language arts and mathematics on the State assessment, as reported for indicators 1.1 and 1.2, the SEA will work with the state assessment contractor to obtain the necessary information for each school and LEA. See the OPI Compliance Agreement with the U.S. Department of Education for processes and timelines.

For goal number 3, the percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools, the percentage of teachers receiving high quality professional development and the percentage of paraprofessionals who are qualified, the SEA will collect data through its annual school data collection process and

ESEA program reports. In addition, certification and accreditation records and reports gathered and maintained by the OPI will be examined.

For goal number 4, the number of persistently dangerous schools per the Montana definition will be collected through the SDFSC final report or the Montana Gun-Free Schools annual data collection report.

For goal number 5, the percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma (disaggregated), and the percentage of students who drop out of school (disaggregated), the SEA currently collects the necessary data through its annual school data collection report.

ESEA program staff will determine, on a regular basis, those schools, LEAs and subgrantees not making satisfactory progress on each of these goals. It will share program progress with participating schools, LEAs and subgrantees and cooperatively with subgrantees to determine options regarding actions to be taken or interventions that will ensure that adequate progress will be made.

PART III: ESEA KEY PROGRAMMATIC REQUIREMENTS AND FISCAL INFORMATION

1. Title I, Part A-Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs

- a. The amount reserved for school improvement under section 1003(a) is 2 percent of the total equaling \$685,815. Of this amount 5 percent will be retained for State-level activities in the amount of \$34,290. These funds will be used to provide assistance to schools and districts identified for improvement to the extent possible. In the past, \$200,000 has been available so the level and scope of services will be greatly reduced. We envision providing face-to-face guidance and assistance at our Title I Conference in September 2002 as well as training in the use of Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) materials we have already purchased for identified schools and districts. On-going assistance by telephone, email, and on-site visits will also be continued using State administration funds, a separate set-aside.
- b. For the 95 percent of the funds set aside for school improvement that must be made available to LEAs (\$685,815) priorities similar to what has been used in the past for Accountability funds will be used to construct a "prioritized" list of recipients. This ensures that the districts greatest in need will be funded first. It is anticipated that all districts needing and eligible for this funding will receive funding. External consultants and professional development providers will be required.
- c. The SEA will use up to 15 percent of administrative funds for assessment development under section 1004. How those funds may be needed will develop

as the assessment development occurs. We foresee supplementing the development as necessary.

- d. The SEA will inform LEAs of the procedures they must use to distribute funds for schools to use for supplemental services under Section 1116(e)(6) and (7) and the procedures for determining the amount to be used for this purpose through written letters and guidance to the affected LEAs in August 2002. The letters and guidance will state the statutory requirements.
- e. Montana will use the formula funds allocated under this part for the development and implementation of a state assessment system in accordance with section 6111 (1) and (2). Funding will pay for the contract recently awarded under the Montana Request for Proposal process to Measured Progress of New Hampshire. The RFP is included in the Appendix of this application. In addition, please see the Montana Compliance Agreement with the U.S. Department of Education in the Appendix of this consolidated application, for the timelines and specific deliverables from Measured Progress. Costs of the contract with Measured Progress will be \$2,499,850 in 2002 and \$2,363,123 in 2004.

In addition, staff will be hired to coordinate the ESEA assessment requirements with state and local assessments, provide technical assistance to LEAs, and work with OPI staff to coordinate activities to improve learning for all students. Staff hired with these funds will also coordinate state and local report cards required by the ESEA. In addition, certain other steps such as clarifying grade level expectations and revising performance descriptors will be supported by these funds.

- e. Funding will also provide for membership in a consortium of rural, western states to facilitate collaboration between states and to help eliminate duplication of effort. Funding will also be used to help provide a federally required test of English Language Proficiency for limited English proficiency students.

2. Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – Even Start Family Literacy

- a. The Montana Even Start Program Performance Indicators were developed to meet the new requirements under Title I, Part B, Sec. 1210 (Even Start Statute), and Subpart 3 of the No Child Left Behind Act. From January 2001, through June 2001, Program Coordinators from each of the seven Montana Even Start Programs, the Montana Even Start Programs Coordinator (Office of Public Instruction), and the State/Local Even Start Programs Evaluator met several times to develop the Indicators. These current Indicators were federally approved on July 1, 2001.

In September 2001, all Montana Local Even Start Program Staff Members (including Coordinators), the Montana Even Start Coordinator, and the Montana and Local Even Start Evaluator met to discuss implementation of the Indicators into each Local Program.

2001-2002 is the pilot year of implementation of the Indicators. Each of the seven Local Program Coordinators will collect data based on the Indicators for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002 (Year-End Report). This data will be submitted to the SEA Even Start Coordinator and the Montana/Local Even Start Evaluator in July 2002. If the targets are missed by over half of the program, adjustment to the indicators will be made for 2002-2003 program year.

Each of the seven Montana Even Start Programs will participate in the Even Start Reporting System. Each Program will collect and submit data twice annually: for the period of July 1 through December 31 (Mid-Year Report), and for the period of July 1 through June 30 (Year-End Report).

The SEA Even Start Coordinator and the Montana/Local Even Start Evaluator will analyze the data provided in the Mid-Year and Year-End Reports to determine whether each Program is meeting the Montana Even Start Performance Indicators. Longevity of the program and the program model will also be taken into consideration. This information will provide information to the SEA on programs meeting the objectives of the program, performance and effectiveness of the local programs, identify effective programs, and will give the SEA the opportunity to provide technical assistance to ensure that local evaluations provide accurate information on the effectiveness of the programs. If a Program is not meeting all Indicators, a peer review team comprised of the SEA Even Start Coordinator, State Even Start Evaluator, State Family Literacy Initiative Coordinator, and a Local Program Coordinator from another effective program will conduct an on-site visit to gather more detailed information and look at the local evaluation. After the visit, the SEA Even Start Program Coordinator will write a report describing the status of the Program in meeting the Indicators. If appropriate, corrective actions and a timeline for completing the corrective actions will be determined by the SEA Program Coordinator and the local Program Coordinator. These actions and the timeline will be stated in the report and progress towards these actions will determine if the program will continue to receive funding after a year.

The SEA Program Specialist will identify, if appropriate, an outside consultant to assist the program improvement with the identified areas of need through technical assistance site visits and professional development activities.

The Montana Performance Indicators are used to determine appropriateness of various assessment and other data collection instruments, and to assist with Statewide Family Literacy Professional Development planning, so that programs will be given many opportunities to improve.

The Even Start Consortium will review the state plan and indicators annually to see if any adjustment/revisions are necessary.

b. Describe what constitutes sufficient program progress when the SEA makes continuation awards.

Using the 2001-2002 MT Performance Indicators data, the program will need to show improvement in meeting the Indicators in July 2002. Other criteria such as longevity of the program and the program model will also be taken into consideration. Besides the indicators, program model and longevity, the SEA will consider the following: progress on indicators of program quality and program objectives, progress toward improving adult and child literacy results and the program compliance with the statute in implementing its local program.

Program(s) not making improvement, as indicated by the Montana Performance Indicators outcomes and other criteria, will be in program improvement.

Within the first six months after identification, programs will participate in the following activities:

- SEA will convene a peer review team to do technical assistance site visit to help program assess and identify needs;
- SEA will write a site-visit report;
- Program(s) will use self-assessment (Guide to Quality for Even Start, RMC2002) to identify needs along with SEA site visit report.
- Program(s) must develop two or three clear obtainable goals based on needs;
- Program(s) must develop and implement a timeline for obtaining goals (activities will be approved by SEA) and
- Program(s) must develop a professional development plan based on needs. The SEA must approve the plan.

The SEA will require sufficient program progress by requiring the local programs report at least three percentage points of gain within one year of the report outcomes for all adults and children. The further a program is from reaching the targeted outcome and the longer a program has been implemented, the greater the expectation of the gain over the course of the year. The report will exclude families that were not enrolled in the program for over three months.

In January 2002, after the first six months the SEA and the Montana/Local Even Start Evaluator will analyze the mid-year report and program criteria to determine if program identified for improvement are showing progress in meeting the objectives of the program as determined by the Montana Performance Indicators. Those programs will: implement the professional development plan with at least two outside entities providing professional development assistance to entire staff employed with Even Start funds (one can be effective program recognized by the SEA);

In July 2003, the SEA and the Montana/Local Even Start Evaluator will analyze the mid-year report along with longevity of program of the program and program model. The SEA will take the following steps if the program hasn't made sufficient progress in reaching their outcomes after one year.

- Notification of intent to discontinued funding for next program year;
- Provide opportunity for program hearing and

- Future funding of program will be based on the hearing outcome.

The program may continue to improve work on achieving program goals during this period.

c. Explain how the State’s Even Start projects will provide assistance to low income families participating in the program to help children in those families to achieve to the applicable Start content and student achievement standards.

There has been training for all Even Start programs and the Even Start consortium members on the state content and performance standards in reading and math. The state does not have standards for children from birth through age five so the programs are using Head Start Standards.

The Montana Even Start programs are required to address in their proposals the best research practices for adults, pre-school aged children and school-aged children. The evaluation of these practices is key to the success of the families and the program. The mid year and year end reports along with the other criteria guides the SEA in selecting the needed technical assistance and professional development to ensure all families and programs are successful.

d. Identify the amount of the reservation under subsection 1233(a) that the state will use for each category of State-level activities listed in that section, and describe how the Sea will carry out those activities.

The SEA will reserve 6 percent of the annual appropriation in Montana for the following state level activities:

- 2003 Allocation \$1,127,500
- SEA Set-Aside \$ 76,650
 - Administration (no more than 3%) \$ 33,825
 - Subcontracting \$ 6,765
 - Indicators of Program Quality \$ 27,000
- Coordination of all technical assistance for program improvement;
- Administering the Montana Performance Indicators of Quality;
- Coordinating the improving the quality of family literacy service providers;
- Coordination of all professional development activities (state conference, coordinators’ meeting, and annual program staff meeting);
- Coordination of Montana Family Literacy Initiative meetings; and
- Coordination of all activities for program in need of improvement.

3. Title I, Part C-Education of Migrant Children

a. Describe the process the State will use to develop, implement, and document a comprehensive needs assessment that identifies the special educational and related needs of migrant children.

Beginning with the 2003 summer programs and the 2003-04 school year, the SEA will utilize a comprehensive needs assessment data collection instrument which will be designed with the assistance of Education Evaluation Experts from the field contracted to provide technical assistance to the SEA and which will elicit information concerning the needs of migrant children derived from local operating agencies who receive a Title I Part C subgrant award as well as from sending state partners and information received from record transfer sources including NGS, other state systems and the Binational Transfer Document. This instrument will have been designed to include a wide range of indicators of educational deprivation, including mobility, school year interruption, English proficiency, achievement and criterion-referenced test scores, appropriate age-grade placement levels, retention, other academic scores, and teachers' perceptions of needs in basic skills areas and will be updated for all succeeding school years.

Prior to the preparation of the Title I Part C comprehensive service delivery plan, local operating agencies operating a project in 2002-03 will be asked to compile data based on the educational records and perceived needs of each migrant child enrolled in funded programs. Local Operating Agencies (LOA) are asked to aggregate the data by grade level and submit it to the SEA, which will aggregate and analyze the data for the state as a whole with the assistance of an evaluation professional.

In addition to the LOA data, special reports will be requested by the SEA from the New Generation System (NGS) regarding the relationship of age and grade for the large percentage of migrant students who migrate from Texas and Washington as well as a summary of achievement information, for these interstate children and intrastate children. Considerable needs assessment information is generated in home base states and transferred to Montana for program planning through the NGS as well as through direct contact with the Texas Migrant Interstate Program and the Washington State Migrant Student Records Office in Sunnyside, Washington. Once a data have been analyzed, a comprehensive needs assessment report will be prepared which will form the basis for educational interventions to be used in the various programs throughout the state. Care will be taken to implement only those interventions which are based upon scientific research. Interventions to be considered, for example, at the elementary level will include reading programs such as Success for All, Direct Instruction, SRA Open Court, Accelerated Reading, SkillsTutor/Achievement for All and LiTArt Literacy Curriculum.

- b. Describe the State's priorities for the use of migrant education program funds in order to meet the State's performance targets for indicators 1.1 1.2 and 2.1 as appendix A (as well as 1.4 6.1 and 6.2 that expressly include migrant students) and how they relate to the State's assessment of needs for services.

SEA instructions to LOAs for submittal of migrant education project applications directs applicants to specify that migrant children who are most mobile and at risk of school failure shall receive first priority for instructional and support services.

Though Identification and Recruitment, Professional Development, and Technology/Resource services take place year round, it is important to note that preponderance of Montana's instructional programs take place in the summer and serve a large number of interstate students who are participating in the accountability systems of their home base states. The Montana MEP provides a high degree of interstate coordination regarding the alignment of curriculum, out of state achievement testing, and instructional continuity for these students. For students who migrate within the state, the SEA migrant program complies with the Office of Public Instruction's mission to raise the level of achievement for all students including migrant students and assures that all school-aged migrant students identified and served during the regular term are included in the state's comprehensive assessment program established in the Title I compliance agreement between the state of Montana and the U.S. Department of Education. It must be noted that many identified eligible migrant students in Montana who are preschool children or out-of-school emancipated/drop-out youth do not attend public school and would not be included in the achievement data. Every effort is taken so that the smaller numbers of students who are served during the regular term are identified as migrant in the state's disaggregation process. To that end, intensive training regarding the inclusion of migrant students in the state's comprehensive assessment program has been given during the 2002-03 school year and will be on-going for the prospective school years.

Montana's summer programs are all site-based, full service programs complete with transportation, nutrition, health, and instructional services. There are no state funds used to provide services to the population. No regular LOA programs are conducted by local school districts in areas where migrant children reside during the months of late May, June, July, and August—months in which large numbers of high priority children are identified in Montana. Each LOA applicant is also required to assure that no child will be prevented from deriving benefit from the program because of inability to speak English or because of limited English language skills and to specify the type of bilingual/ESL assistance such children will receive. All eligible school-age children are targeted for service in Montana's Summer Migrant Program, but strict enforcement of compulsory attendance laws for older children is difficult because of their family work requirements. For that reason, special night programs are offered where the special educational needs of secondary migrant children are met through alternative programs, such as NOVANet-distance learning classes, University of Texas courses, and PASS (Portable Assisted Study Sequence) program. Further, to ensure that these priorities are observed, LOA applications are carefully reviewed. The SEA monitors each LOA during the course of the project term in order to assure that children's needs are being served according to established priorities. The LOA assures the SEA that priority will be given to the most mobile and educationally disadvantaged children and that an individual needs assessment is performed for each child served. LOAs assure that services are provided proportionately to needs. Application will be reviewed to assure that children will be served in accordance to need.

- c. Answered in Part II, item 2
- d. Describe how the state will promote continuity of education and the interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children.

The principal instrument for providing continuity of instruction for highly mobile migrant children is the full utilization of its electronic student information exchange system, the New Generation System in collaboration with its primary sending states of Texas and Washington, as well as other participating states. The SEA is committed to full utilization of the system by providing access and training for program staff. Every effort is made by the SEA to ensure that data is quickly transmitted from the LOA to the NGS at both enrollment and withdrawal of students and has a four-day window for completion of data entry as its goal. Operations in the state have been designed to provide the most efficient, cost-effective method of maintaining a continuous influx of data during peak program months (June-August).

Training by NGS personnel for Mt. MEP is provided twice during the year and the SEA director participates on the Management Team of the system. The Mt. MEP program assistant is part of the Advisory Committee for NGS and participates in meetings and trainings twice a year. Data provided by NGS includes but is not limited to pertinent demographic information such as grade, age, previous school, achievement test scores, secondary courses, graduation plans, credit accrual information, and health information. Without such information, continuity of instruction would be impossible. Records are made available so that teachers and nurses are able to provide appropriate services. The SEA assures that all appropriate information will be updated on the records at the school's closure in a timely fashion so that other states may utilize that information, as it is needed. All necessary achievement data and desired outcome data will be entered into the NGS for each program participant. In addition to the New Generation System of electronic transfer, the Mt. MEP participates in the National Migrant Education Hot Line and the Binational Migrant Education Program for students from Mexico with its Transfer Document component. In the interest of interstate coordination and the improvement of academic and support services for migrant children, the Montana MEP also fully participates in the following interstate projects and programs:

- (1) National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education, NASDME
- (2) Project SMART (Summer Migrants Access Resources through Technology)
- (3) Project Estrella, a lap top project for secondary youth
- (4) Migrant Education Comprehensive Consortia (MECCA)
- (5) Midwest Migrant Education Resource Consortia (MMERC)
- (6) Migrant Youth Grant (through Texas Employment & Training, and Rural Employment Opportunities)

- (7) University of Texas Migrant Student Program; Advisory Committee
- (8) PASS, (Portable Assisted Study Program)
- (9) Binational Program through South West Texas University
- (10) Gloria Mattera Scholarship Fund
- (11) Regional Hep/CAMP

The SEA works closely with the Texas Interstate Migrant Office, the University of Texas Special Projects Office, and the Region One Education Service Center in Texas, as well as the Washington SEA and the Sunnyside Washington Migrant Student Center. Every effort is made to provide educational continuity for the mobile migrant children who travel from other states to Montana. Montana secondary outreach teachers are particularly active in interstate coordination activities and routinely call home base state counselors in order to maintain the close communication necessary in secondary credit accrual. Sending state teachers are often hired in Montana summer projects to maintain an even closer interstate link for students. To the extent possible, the SEA will continue to participate in advisory committees, consortia, or other projects with interstate coordination emphasis for the improvement of achievement of migrant students.

- e. Describe State's Plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its migrant education program and projects.

Evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the state program will be based on data collected from a number of sources. The SEA program evaluator, META Associates, will collect data from each LOA subgrantee. This information will be aggregated with that gathered from meetings with LOA staff and that derived from scheduled compliance monitoring visits. Also to be used will be data in the Management Reports provided by NGS. From these sources, data will be derived concerning type and extent of services provided including student outcome data, a demographic breakdown of the population served, and a measurement of service impact. Submitted data concerning student gains will be carefully evaluated. Each LOA operating agency will be required to comply with performance objectives for each major instructional activity (SMART, NOVANET, MASTERY, AND TECHMOBILE, LiTART, Accelerated Reading, Success of All, SkillsTutor, and others) so that there will be tangible measurement of student gains at the end of the project period. Interstate Coordination Activities and Professional Development activities will also be evaluated. Generally, the evaluation process will include: 1) objective evaluation of the total program (instructional programs, support services, preschool programs, recruitment, and parent involvement) and 2) oral interviews and written reports from each project site director, the instructors and support staff, and parents. An evaluation of all interstate and intrastate instructional and support coordination activities will also be conducted.

In the academic area of basic skills, evaluation will focus on areas of treatment, such as reading. Criterion-referenced tests will be administered at the primary

and elementary levels. Secondary students will be assessed as part of the Montana Youth Grant and the extent to which they earned course credits.

- f. Identify the amount of funds that the SEA will retain from its Migrant Education Program (MEP) allocation, under section 200.41 of the Title I regulations (34CFR200.41) to carry out administrative and program functions that are unique to the MEP and describe how the SEA will use those funds.

Montana will use MEP program funds for the following:

- (1) Coordination of statewide identification and recruitment;
- (2) Oversight of certification of eligibility process and data verification;
- (3) Coordination and implementation of interstate and international activities;
- (4) Coordination with out of state public and private agencies regarding local project-level activities;
- (5) Coordination of NGS activities;
- (6) Coordination of interstate/binational evaluation activities;
- (7) Coordination of all consortia activities;
- (8) Coordination of professional development;
- (9) Coordination of credit accrual activities; and
- (10) Coordination with out of state assessment programs.

Personnel	
Migrant Program Director (Angela Branz-Spall - .80 FTE Title I Migrant)	
Migrant Program Assistant (Pat Wade - .50 FTE Title I Migrant)	
Migrant Program Assistant (Joan Franke - .10 FTE Title I Migrant)	
TOTAL Personnel	<u>\$57,059</u>
Fringe Benefits	
TOTAL PERSONNEL	<u>\$71,292</u>
Operating Costs	<u>\$56,913</u>
17% Indirect	<u>\$21,795</u>
GRAND TOTAL	<u>\$150,000</u>

4. Title I, Part D-Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk

- a. The goal of the program is to assist correctional facilities and local N&D programs to help students achieve academic success in the same challenging State academic content and achievement standards that all children in the State are expected to meet. The effectiveness of the each program will be assessed through a year-end Final Report that provides data on the numbers of youth who return to school or postsecondary education upon leaving a correctional facility, numbers of youth obtaining diplomas, GED or other equivalent certificate, and number of youth gaining

employment upon leaving the correctional facility. This data will be evaluated by the facility and SEA to determine needed changes to increase program success.

- b. The SEA will provide technical assistance in the beginning of the project to help coordinate contacts between school districts, correctional facilities and post-secondary facilities. That coordination will continue throughout the year as needed. The SEA will assist each project with needed school district information and key contacts related to transitional services. The SEA will provide two to three opportunities each year for faculty and staff of schools, correctional facilities and group homes to discuss challenges and ideas for successful transition programs.
- c. Guidance for the state agencies and LEAs for use of funds under Section 1418 is included in the 2002-2003 Application for Neglected and Delinquent Programs. The guidance contains a description of the use of funds for transitional services and the requirements for meeting the needs of youth transitioning to and from correctional facilities in Montana. The SEA will provide technical assistance to the State Agency and LEAs regarding transition services and preparation of the application for funds. Guidance received by the SEA from the U.S. Department of Education regarding transition issues will be printed and forwarded to all participating agencies.

5. Title I, Part F-Comprehensive School Reform

- a. Describe the process the State educational agency will use to ensure that programs funded include and integrate all 11 required components of a comprehensive school reform program.

Each applicant for CSR funds must submit an application to the OPI that includes the 11 required components of a comprehensive school reform program. A comprehensive school reform program is one that:

- (1) employs proven strategies and proven methods for student learning, teaching, and school management that are based on scientifically based research and effective practices and have been replicated successfully in schools;
- (2) integrates a comprehensive design for effective school functioning, including instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, parental involvement, and school management, that aligns the school's curriculum, technology, and professional development into a comprehensive school reform plan for schoolwide change designed to enable all students to meet challenging State content and student academic achievement standards and addresses needs identified through a school needs assessment;
- (3) provides high quality and continuous teacher and staff professional development;

- (4) includes measurable goals for student academic achievement and benchmarks for meeting such goals;
- (5) is supported by teachers, principals, administrators, school personnel staff, and other professional staff;
- (6) provides support for teachers, principals, administrators, and other school staff;
- (7) provides for the meaningful involvement of parents and the local community in planning, implementing, and evaluating school improvement activities consistent with section 1118 (parent involvement);
- (8) uses high quality external technical support and assistance from an entity that has experience and expertise in schoolwide reform and improvement, which may include an institution of higher education;
- (9) includes a plan for the annual evaluation of the implementation of school reforms and the student results achieved;
- (10) identifies other resources, including Federal, State, local, and private resources, that shall be used to coordinate services that will support and sustain the comprehensive school reform effort; and
- (11) has been found, through scientifically based research to significantly improve the academic achievement of students participating in such programs as compared to students in schools that have not participated in such program; or has been found to have strong evidence that such program will significantly improve the academic achievement of participating children.

Each application is scored by three members of a field review panel and must receive an average score of 70 percent of the maximum allowable points before consideration for funding by the OPI. A copy of the application form is included as an Attachment. A copy of the scoring rubric used by members of the field review panel is included as an Attachment.

b. Describe the process the State will use to determine the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform schools with increasing numbers of students meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Each successful applicant for CSR funds must complete a Comprehensive School Reform Program Local Evaluation Report which includes student achievement data by proficiency level for reading and mathematics. A copy of the CSR Local Evaluation Report is included as an Attachment. Aggregate student achievement data for grades 4, 8, or 11 will be used to determine the percentage of schools, by cohort, with increasing numbers of students meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on State assessments during their three years of funding.

6. Title II, Part A – Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

a. Remainder of State’s annual measurable objectives under Section 1119(a)(2)

Goal No. 1: All teachers are highly qualified not later than the end of the 2005-06 school year.

Measurable Objective 1: Eighty percent of LEAs will report all teachers are highly qualified by spring of 2003. This figure will increase by 5 percent per year until spring of 2006.

Note: Many Montana LEAs have all their teachers at a high-quality level, so will not show a change. Although most Montana teachers are certified, some are teaching out of their endorsement areas, a situation that will be corrected before 2005-06.

Goal No. 2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development to enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful will grow yearly.

Measurable Objective 2: Eighty percent of Montana teachers will report receiving high-quality professional development to enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful by spring of 2003. This figure will increase by 5 percent per year until spring of 2006.

b. The SEA will hold the LEAs accountable for meeting the annual measurable objectives listed above and for ensuring that the professional development offered by LEAs meets the definition of professional development in 9101(24). The SEA will inform all Title II, Part A districts of their obligations and the definitions of terms. In the fall of 2003, all districts will be required to report on their Title II, Part A activities and teachers will be surveyed about their professional development experiences. Each year, the number of districts meeting the objectives and the number of teachers reporting high-quality professional development will increase.

c. The SEA and the SAHE will share the 1 percent of the grant funds according to the allocation tables provided in the May 22, 2002, memo from Arthur Cole. The Montana allocation for Title II, Part A is \$13,567,163 with \$12,759,918 administered by the SEA for LEA formula grants and \$335,787 for state activities. The SAHE will use \$335,787 for subgrants to eligible partnerships.

The total amount administered by the SEA is \$13,213,985 of which \$118,280 will be used for administration. Of the \$353,178 SAHE portion, \$17,391 will be used to administer the subgrants to eligible partnerships.

7. Title II, Part D-Enhancing Education Through Technology

The Montana Office of Public Instruction's (OPI), long-term strategies for improving student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through the effective use of

technology in the classroom and the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction include the following:

1. The OPI is currently completing the draft of the Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan required of all districts by the Montana Board of Public Education. This plan must, through a data-driven approach, reflect the student academic achievement targets, teacher professional development needs, and curriculum and instruction needs of the district including the effective use of technology for instruction and student learning,
2. The OPI has completed, through the use of district-level consultants, Standards Integration Charts that illustrate how the various Montana Content and Performance Standards overlap. These charts are available on the OPI Web site and are actively promoted state-wide as a technology integration tool,
3. The OPI disperses technology funding for Montana schools. Funding is dependent upon the harvest of timber on state lands. The timber harvest must exceed 18 million board feet in one year before funds are generated. Typically, funding is provided to school districts every other year. Districts may now run a mill levy to fund technology. The enabling legislation creates a "Technology Depreciation Fund" at the local level when the levy is passed by voters. All revenues for technology are budgeted and accounted for locally but must address local needs as they relate to state and federal requirements for professional development, student and teacher literacy, and improvement of student academic achievement, and
4. The Office of Public Instruction state technology plan goals and measurable objectives, utilized directly in the formula and the competitive funding programs, target student achievement on state standards, technology literacy for students and teachers.

Goal No. 1

Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction: All Montana teachers will be effective and efficient integrators of technology into their curriculum and teaching.

Measurable Objective 1.1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Teachers' Technology Use in Teaching and Learning section of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by spring 2007.

Goal No. 2

Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction: All Montana teachers will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standards for students.

Measurable Objective 2.1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of Montana teachers K-12 will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standard 3—Students use a variety of technologies for Communication--by spring 2007 as measured by the Montana Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study.

Measurable Objective 2.2: Eighty-five percent (85%) of Montana teachers K-12 will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standard 6—Students apply technological abilities and knowledge to construct new personal understanding--by spring 2007 as measured by the Montana Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study, standard 6 subsection.

Measurable Objective 2.3: Eighty-five percent (85%) of Montana teachers K-12 will know, understand and be able to teach the content knowledge required by the Montana Technology Content and Performance Standard 2 –Students use a variety of Technologies to Enhance Productivity -by Spring 2007 as measured by the Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study, standard 2 subsection.

Goal No. 3

Increasing the Ability of Teachers to Teach: All Montana teachers and principals will be technologically proficient.

Measurable Objective 3.1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a “3” or better as measured by the Teachers’ Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2007.

1.1 Goal No. 4

Enabling Students to meet challenging State standards: All Montana students will be technologically proficient by eighth grade.

Measurable Objective 4.1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of students will rate themselves as a “3” or better as measured by the Students’ Technology Skills

section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by spring 2007.

5. Title II, Part D formula funding has targeted three of the Montana Content and Performance Standards for Technology through district-level measurable objectives aimed at increasing teachers' ability to teach utilizing technology through increasing their understanding of the standards and their abilities to teach them. The standards were identified as areas of need via the Montana Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development Study conducted during the 2000-2001 school year. The self-assessment identified the teacher comfort with the standards and benchmarks for technology. Utilizing that information, the OPI is targeting the three standards that were of most concern to Montana teachers. Standards 3 – Students use a variety of technologies for communication, 6 – Students apply technological abilities and knowledge to construct new personal understanding, and Standard 2 -- Students use a variety of technologies to enhance productivity (see measurable objectives 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3),
6. Title II, Part D formula funding has targeted technology integration (increasing the ability of teachers to teach) and student technology proficiencies (enabling students to meet challenging state standards) through district-level measurable objectives (1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, and 4.1),
7. Title II, Part D competitive funding will target the same three content and performance standards as well as the technology integration and student proficiencies through district level measurable objectives (1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, and 4.1), and
8. The OPI federal programs staff is quite small which encourages and enables cross-program coordination. Program staff meet on a regular basis to explore the common program goals and regularly work together on relevant projects.

Key activities that the OPI will conduct or sponsor with the funds it retains at the state level include the following:

1. Collaboration with the Northwest Educational Technology Consortium (NETC) at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL), in Portland, Oregon to provide regional technical assistance to districts on program evaluation related issues in addition to their ongoing work on technology related issues in Montana,
2. Provide technical assistance to targeted districts for the formula and competitive applications for Title II, Part D funding,
3. Provide the Montana Eisenhower Teacher Self-Assessment and Professional Development study survey instrument (on-line) for funded districts to utilize for

baseline and follow-up data to document progress toward the measurable objectives,

4. Continue the development of partnerships with state level technology groups and service providers such as the Burn's Telecommunications Center at the Montana State University in Bozeman, Montana, the three PT3 grants located at universities in Montana, the Montana Small Schools Alliance, and the Bill Gates Leadership grant, and
5. Implement the formula and competitive grant funded programs for targeted districts utilizing district level individuals on teams to design, implement and evaluate proposals and program outcomes.

Descriptions of how the SEA will ensure that students and teachers, particularly those in the schools of high-need LEAs, have increased access to technology, and how the SEA will coordinate the application and award process for state funds under this part include:

1. Targeting funds to high-need LEA's as per guidance (high poverty, low-performing and high technology need), utilizing appropriate district-level data,
2. Providing technical assistance to targeted districts for the formula and competitive applications for Title II, Part D funding on program requirements, program development and implementation and evaluation issues, and
3. Implementing the formula and competitive grant funded program for targeted districts utilizing district level individuals on teams to design, implement and evaluate proposals and program outcomes.

Descriptions of key procedures, selection criteria, and priorities the state will use to award competitive subgrants under Title II, Part D include:

1. Competitive grants will focus upon measurable objectives (state priorities) targeting integration of technology into curriculum and instruction, increasing the ability of teachers to teach utilizing technology, and enabling students to meet challenging state standards,
2. Competitive grants will be targeted to high-need LEA's as per guidance (high poverty, low-performing and high technology need), utilizing appropriate district level data, also taking into account effective partnerships that can be created to ensure effective integration and the use of proven teaching practices,
3. District level technology plans will be submitted as a part of the application process to ensure that required elements are included and that the technology vision is consistent with best practices and funding requirements,

4. Districts that receive a formula level award that is not of sufficient size to be effective will be given priority in the competitive funding process, and
5. Grants will be designed to ensure for sufficient size and scope (multi-year) to allow for the effective and efficient accomplishment of the required objectives.

Performance Indicator 1.5: The percentage of students that meet or exceed State standards for student literacy in technology.		
State Performance Target	Baseline Data	
Eighty-five percent (85%) of students will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Students' Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking a Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) (or equivalent measure) by spring 2007.	To be collected fall 2002.	
Performance Indicator 4.3: The percentage of teachers qualified to use technology for instruction.		
State Performance Target	Baseline Data	
4.3.1 Eighty-five percent (85%) of teachers will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Teachers' Technology Use in Teaching and Learning section of the Taking a Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) (or equivalent measure) by spring 2007.	To be collected fall 2002.	
Performance Indicator 5.5: The number of schools in which all students are able to work from a networked computer.		
State Performance Target	Baseline Data	
5.5.1 One hundred percent (100%) of students in Montana school districts will be able to work from a networked computer as measured by the TAGLIT survey data by spring 2007.		

Description of State goals and alignment of technology goals.

1. All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014.
2. All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English.
3. By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
4. All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
5. All students will graduate from high school.

The Office of Public Instruction's goals for instructional technology focus upon **Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction, Increasing the Ability of Teachers to Teach, and Enabling Students to meet challenging State standards.** The three areas encompass the five state goals and provide underlying support for their accomplishment. Technology is a tool to be used transparently in teaching and learning that enhances the learning and motivation to learn. Through the focus upon enhancing teacher's abilities to teach with technology utilizing basic technology skills as well as content specific technology applications appropriate to the content areas, teacher quality and thus, instruction is improved. By focusing upon the technology content standards, and technology use in the context of the content areas through the related standards, student's abilities to meet State standards will be enhanced, as well as their motivation to learn. All of these areas work to create appealing and supportive learning environments ultimately leading to increased student satisfaction and increased graduation rates.

8. Title III Part A – English Language Acquisition

- a. The SEA will establish a review process for subgrantee applications that will utilize members of the SEA LEP advisory committee who have expertise in educating LEP students. The committee will rely on guidance from OELA, resources from the National Clearinghouse, and the Center for Applied Linguistics to development guidelines incorporating scientifically based research on the education of LEP students that will be used in establishing criteria to rate district applications. Most of the school districts that are eligible for CSRD and Reading Excellence funding in Montana are districts with the highest LEP populations in the state. It is anticipated that districts will use funds under Title III to coordinate with these programs that also require instructional practices based on scientific research. Part of the review process for awarding subgrants under Title III will include a review of districts' goals and activities under these programs. Recognizing that research in the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students recommends the inclusion of students' language and culture in their educational program, the SEA will include in the application process a description of practices and materials that districts will employ to do this. It is anticipated that this would encompass reading materials developed commercially and locally to supplement the reading program.
- b. The SEA will follow the process used in Title I to hold subgrantees accountable for meeting annual measurable achievement objectives and making adequate yearly progress for LEP students.

- c. It is expected that Montana will be eligible for the minimum state allocation of \$175,000. The SEA will reserve \$100,000 for State-level activities as follows:
 - 1) Professional Development – 10%
 - 2) Planning – 10%
 - 3) Evaluation -- 5%
 - 4) Administration – 40%
 - 5) Interagency coordination – 5%
 - 6) Technical assistance – 20%
 - 7) Recognition – 5%
- d. In the last 5 years no districts in Montana have experienced significant increases in percentages or numbers of immigrant children; therefore 5% will be reserved for these subgrants. In the event that no district experiences significant increases, the funds will be re-allocated to districts serving LEP students.
- e. As part of the annual data collection conducted by the SEA in the fall, districts will indicate the numbers of LEP and immigrant students enrolled. The SEA will review this data to determine if districts have experienced significant increases of immigrant students. In the past five years, there have been 3 to 4 school districts in the state eligible for small amounts of Emergency Immigrant funds. The SEA anticipates that these are the same districts that could possibly experience increases since they are urban centers where employment may be available. Subgrants will be given to districts that have experienced a 30% increase in their immigrant student population.
- f. The LEP survey that the SEA completed and submitted to OELA on April 30 (Please refer to Part II 1 i) indicated that the number of LEP students in Montana is 7,567.
- g. Based on the same survey, the number of immigrant children and youth in Montana is 171.
- 9. Title IV, Part A – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Goal 4)
 - a. Since 1986, the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) and Montana Board of Crime Control (MBCC) have collaborated to assure cooperative use of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities funds within Montana. Strategic planning is accomplished through: a) the Interagency Coordinating Council on Prevention which is a statutorily established Governor’s cabinet-level Council charged with statewide strategic planning for prevention programs administered by state agencies and, b) the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Advisory Council which includes LEA representatives and OPI

and MBCC program specialists. These two efforts assure statewide policy-level collaboration and community level cooperation for the broad range of prevention programs funded by Title IV Part A funds in Montana.

- i. MBCC requires that all community-based applicants describe their cooperative planning with the local LEA, documented through letters of support, which are submitted with their applications. In some circumstances projects are jointly supported with OPI and MBCC funds. Staff from each administrative agency participates in the review of applications to assure that activities are supplementing but not duplicating those funded from other sources.
- ii. Each administrative agency requires that applicants describe how their program activities comply with the Principles of Effectiveness. MBCC distributes the OPI document (“Principles of Effectiveness”) to potential applicants of Governor’s funds to assure their understanding of this requirement. The Principles of Effectiveness are included in OPI’s Web site and linked through MBCC’s Web site.
- iii. Each administrative agency requires that applicants describe how their program activities are in compliance with the purposes of Title IV Part A.

Each year regional workshops are planned and conducted jointly by OPI and MBCC for all Safe and Drug-Free Schools project directors from the LEA and community-based programs. The agenda is designed and presented by a team representing both administrative agencies. Technical assistance regarding federal requirements is an integral component of the regional workshops.

- b. The following information has been obtained from Montana's 2001 Youth Risk Behavior Survey, the surveillance instrument used with 7th and 8th graders and high school students in grades 9-12.

Performance indicator 1: The percentage of students who carried a weapon (for example, a gun, knife, or club) on school property (in the 30 days prior to the survey).

- 7th/8th grades: 24.3%
- 9th-12th grades: 21.3%

Performance indicator 2: The percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey).

- 7th/8th grades: 40.3%
- 9th-12th grades: 31.5%

Performance indicator 3: The percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey).

- 7th/8th grades: 17%
- 9th-12th grades: 29.5%

Performance indicator 4: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

- 0 (The policy defining persistently dangerous schools was established in April 2002, therefore no data is available at this time)

Montana currently utilizes the Youth Risk Behavior Survey administered by the Office of Public Instruction and the Prevention Needs Assessment administered by the Department of Health and Human Services. In our judgment those two surveillance documents meet or exceed the requirements of a uniform management information and reporting system.

10. Title IV Part A, subpart 1, section 4112(a) – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State funds for the Governor (Goal 4)

a. Montana reserves 20% of the state allocation for use by the Governor.

b. Designated agency:
Montana Board of Crime Control
Jim Oppedahl, Executive Director
PO Box 201408
Helena MT 59620-1408
406-444-3604
DUNS #: 606864478

11. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, section 4126 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants (Goal 4)

The Office of Public Instruction will develop a partnership with the Montana Board of Crime Control (MBCC) to integrate and enhance the Community Service program into existing community-based programs. The MBCC is the state justice-planning agency that administers the governor's Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Community Funds and other U.S. Department of Justice pass-through funds currently supporting similar programs within the state.

A joint invitation from OPI and MBCC will be issued prior to July 2002 to announce availability of funds and invite applications. Applications will be distributed to eligible applicants: LEAs, community-based organizations and public and private non-profit entities. The existing community service projects will be an audience for the program announcement.

A joint OPI/MBCC review panel will select the most competitive applications for sub-contract through OPI. Selection will be determined based on: high degree of program sustainability as evidenced by existing or promising community service infrastructure; documentation of cooperative agreement between the school district, justice department, law enforcement and program site; overall quality of program proposal; and description of allowable program activities as allowed by the Act.

Sub-contracts will be awarded by September 2002 for a 12-month contractual period. Projects will be required to provide project activity reports on a schedule and prescribed format as determined by OPI. Contract monitoring will be provided by OPI Safe and Drug-Free School staff; technical assistance will be provided by MBCC and OPI staff, according to the type of assistance required and the particular expertise of staff required.

12. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers (Goals 1,2, and 5)

Montana will identify the percentage of students participating in 21st Century Community Learning Centers who meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on State assessment in reading and mathematics through the semi-annual reporting requirement for projects funded through a competitive application process.

13. Title V, Part A, Innovative Programs

a. i.-iv. The SEA formula for distributing Title V, Part A program funds to LEAs is described here. The elements used for Title V, Part A are public enrollment, collected the previous October by the Montana Office of Public Instruction, census information for census 5-17 year-old poverty count (presently 1990 census with 1997 updates), census total 5-17 year-old population count and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) locale code for a rural/sparsity factor. Title V, Part A also uses private enrollment counts collected by the Montana Office of Public Instruction, which are enrollment counts for nonpublic schools that indicated their intent to participate in Title VI program in FY 2002.

A district must have five percent or more of its students meeting the census poverty criteria to receive the poverty factor. The census poverty numbers, extracted from the prior year Title I allocation spreadsheet are used to determine how many "poverty" children aged 5-17 are within a school district boundary. The census total 5-17 population is used as the denominator, to calculate the poverty percentage. If the district meets the five percent or more poverty criteria, the district's 5-17 year-old poverty count is used as the poverty factor.

For the sparsity factor to apply, two conditions must be met. First, the district must have enrollment below a certain number (but above 0). For elementary districts the number is 120, for high school districts the number is 60, and for K-12 districts, the number is 180. Secondly, the majority of students within a district must attend schools that have a designation of "rural" as determined by the Bureau of Census. The census code designating "rural" is a census "locale code" of "7" or "8". This "sparsity" factor is calculated by subtracting the total district enrollment plus participating nonpublic enrollment from the number above to determine how "sparsely" the school is populated. If the district enrollment is below the set number, the difference between the set number and the enrollment is divided by two (because the sparsity factor is given a weight of 0.5). However, the district receives this additional weighting only if it also has been designated with a census locale code of "7" or "8". Nonpublic schools within the bounds

of the public school are assumed to have the same locale code as the public school to which they are attached.

To calculate the allocation, all the factors are added together, i.e., public enrollment plus, enrollment of nonpublic schools that indicated intent to participate in Title VI, plus the applicable 5-17 year-old poverty counts for districts that met the 5 percent poverty or greater requirement, plus the sparsity factor for districts that met that requirement. The total of all factors is divided by the dollar amount available for distribution to school districts. Then, each district receives an allocation proportionally based on the district share of the total factors generated statewide.

The total Montana allocation for Title V, Part A is \$1,911,525 with \$1,624,796 administered by the SEA for LEA formula grants and \$286,729 for state activities. Fifteen percent of the state activities portion or \$43,009.35 will be used for administration of Title V, Part A, leaving \$243,720 for state-level activities.

Montana will use \$243,270 of ESEA Title V, Part A, Innovative Education funds for state-level activities to assist districts and schools to meet the five ESEA Goals adopted by the State of Montana and to meet the needs of all students. Funds will be used as follows:

1. Eighty percent to support the development and implementation
 - a. Of the State Superintendent's Montana Reading Initiative so that all students attain proficiency or better in reading through access to high quality instruction based on scientific research;
 - b. Of the continuation of Data Strategies work with districts to enable teachers, administrators and parents to use assessment data to improve instruction;
 - c. Of the development of regional clearinghouses and academies for professional development activities determined necessary by educators in each of the five regions of Montana;
 - d. Of the support for the implementation of the Indian Education for All Plan (Indian children represent the largest group of LEA children in Montana); and
 - e. Of the support for other technical assistance to enhance the use of scientifically based research in Montana classrooms and schools.
2. Ten percent to support high quality teachers as they work to increase graduation rates of Montana students and to increase the academic performance of all Montana students; Dissemination of research-based practices will be conducted through state and regional symposia, the OPI Web site, and publications.
3. Ten percent to provide assistance to OPI staff to continue to support LEA reform. Activities will include networking personnel from districts in order to share data of what works to improve learning for Montana students. Scientifically based model programs will be showcased through publications

and conferences to share successful strategies to improve student performance.

14. Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111-State Assessments Formula Grants

Montana will use the formula funds allocated under this part for the development and implementation of a state assessment system in accordance with section 6111 (1) and (2). Funding will pay for the contract recently awarded under the Montana Request for Proposal process to Measured Progress of New Hampshire. The RFP is included in the Appendix of this application. In addition, please see the Montana Compliance Agreement with the U.S. Department of Education in the Appendix of this consolidated application, for the timelines and specific deliverables from Measured Progress. Costs of the contract with Measured Progress will be \$2,499,850 in 2002 and \$2,363,123 in 2004.

In addition, staff will be hired to coordinate the ESEA assessment requirements with state and local assessments, provide technical assistance to LEAs, and work with OPI staff to coordinate activities to improve learning for all students. Staff hired with these funds will also coordinate state and local report cards required by the ESEA.

Funding will also provide for membership in a consortium of rural, western states to facilitate collaboration between states and to help eliminate duplication of effort. Funding will also be used to help provide a federally required test of English Language Proficiency for limited English proficiency students.

15. Title VI Part B Subpart 2 – Rural and Low-Income School Program (Goals 1, 2, 3, 5)

- a. The OPI has adopted the five ESEA Goals and their corresponding performance indicators. OPI's goals under Title VI's Rural and Low-Income Schools Program are to:
- increase student academic achievement (Goal 1: all students will attain proficiency or better in reading and math, and Goal 3: all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers), and
 - decrease student dropout rates (Goal 5: all students will graduate from high school).

The performance indicators OPI will use to establish a measurement basis include:

- for Goal 1: the percent of students who are at or above proficiency in reading and in math on the state assessment;
- for Goal 3: the percent of classes being taught by highly qualified teachers, the percent of teachers receiving high quality professional development, and the percent of paraprofessionals who are qualified; and
- for Goal 5: the percent of students who graduate from high school, and the percent of students who drop out of school.

The RLI funds provided to local districts may help OPI meet the identified goals and performance indicators by providing additional financial resources that can augment other resources available to the districts to recruit and retain high quality teachers and paraprofessionals, to purchase/provide high quality professional development and training for teachers and paraprofessionals, and to provide effective research-based learning experiences for students. These improved educational services should have an impact on student performance on state assessment tests. Thus, the RLI funds should help the SEA meet the ESEA goals and performance indicators it has adopted.

- b. The OPI will make awards to eligible school districts via a formula proportionate to the number of students in eligible districts. Eligible districts (i.e., local education agencies, or LEAs) are those that: (a) are not eligible for Subpart 1 of Title VI Part B, (b) serve only schools that have an NCES school locale code of 6, 7 or 8, and (c) have a poverty rate of at least 20 percent (i.e., at least 20 percent of the children aged 5-17 served by the LEA are from families with an income below the poverty line). Eligible districts will be informed about the allowable uses of RLI funds as per Section 6222 of Title VI Part B Subpart 2.

GEPA (General Education Provisions Act), Section 427

Montana's Constitution guarantees its citizens "equality of education opportunity" (1972 Montana Constitution, Article X) and specifically guarantees, "No person shall be refused admission to any public educational institution on account of sex, race, creed, religion, political beliefs, or national origin." The Montana Human Rights Act reiterates these guarantees (Montana Codes Annotated 49-2-307 and 49-3-202.)

The Montana Board of Public Education's accreditation standards include Rule 10.55.802, Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM), stating that Montana school districts shall not discriminate. The rule states that school districts shall not discriminate against any student on the basis of sex, race, marital status, national origin, or handicapping condition in any area of accreditation. This includes programs, facilities, textbooks, curriculum, counseling, library service and extracurricular activities. It is the purpose of the accreditation standards to guarantee equality of educational opportunity to each person.

In addition, the Montana accreditation standards include Rule 10.55.701 (ARM) requires each school district to have a written equity policy and a written policy of students, parents and teachers due process rights. The State Superintendent, acting through the Office of Public Instruction, reviews Montana school district's compliance with the accreditation standards and makes accreditation recommendations to the Board of Public Education.

The State Superintendent and her staff have been, and continue to be, committed to providing equitable access to, and participation in, state-level activities for all students, teachers, and other beneficiaries with special needs. In the past, federal and state-level programs have used a variety of methods to ensure such equity of access and participation. The OPI staff, in conjunction with LEAs, has identified the following steps as effective in addressing challenges of equity. The steps listed below represent successful efforts used over time by the OPI as well as new approaches. The following have been identified as effective to addressing challenges of equity:

1. Improve communication between the SEA, LEAs, and communities by involving parents, community members, and associations in the planning and evaluation of instructional programs. Establish, coordinate, and maintain communication systems with various groups throughout the state. Such groups may include:
 - a. Regional Montana Association of School Superintendents (MASS) meetings;
 - b. Montana Parents, Teachers, and Students Associations;
 - c. Advisory Groups;
 - d. ESEA Title I Committee of Practitioners;
 - e. Title I Distinguished Educators and Facilitators;
 - f. Montana Board of Public Education; and
 - g. Governor's Office.
2. Establish regular meetings with specific OPI program directors, ESEA steering committee, working groups, and others related to the ESEA program implementation, e.g., district superintendents and clerks, to develop procedures that promote flexibility for the LEA and solve problems as the ESEA programs are implemented.
3. Develop an LEA consolidated application that supports reaching the ESEA goals for all students, that demonstrates how federal and qualifying state funds are targeted to the ESEA goals and the goals developed by each district, that contains a sufficient GEPA 427 statement, and that can be reviewed by SEA staff.
4. Develop LEA application forms that encourage reaching the ESEA goals
5. Develop a consolidated LEA application process that is clear, concise and expedient for the LEA and SEA. Benefits include:
 - a. SEA time saved through the consolidated process to be used to provide technical assistance to districts needing help in developing, implementing and meeting the ESEA goals.
 - b. The consolidated application process will increase LEAs time to provide more direct services to students.
 - c. The consolidated process will increase the time the LEA and SEA staff use to coordinate program goals and review results.
6. Encourage activities within the SEA that lead toward improvement in the operation and focus of the work of the office.
7. Refine the Common Assurances form to reduce school district paperwork and streamline operations and communications.

8. Develop, where possible, a common timeline across covered programs, e.g., final report due dates and consolidated application due dates.
9. Utilize equity-trained staff to provide technical assistance to the OPI staff.
10. Review by division all program training and outreach materials for bias regarding: gender, race, age, disability and language.
11. Ensure that state-level panels, advisory groups, committees, and task forces associated with ESEA programs reflect the diversity of the state.
12. Sponsor comprehensive technical assistance programs for LEAs that model the consolidated planning and implementation processes.
 - a. Structure outreach to rural districts and/or communities with populations of traditionally under-served populations.
 - b. Plan programs with explicit focus on addressing needs of under-represented groups.

Use METNET, a statewide electronic network, Internet and other technological/electronic methods to promote programs and activities. These networks will include information on competitive grants, professional development opportunities, reporting announcement, etc.

CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS

1. The Montana SEA does **not** plan to consolidate State-level administrative funds.
2. N/A

TRANSFERABILITY

The Montana SEA does **not** plan to transfer non-administrative State-level ESEA funds under the provisions of the State and Local Transferability Act (ESEA).

ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

General and Cross-Cutting Assurances

Description: Section 9304(a) requires States to have on file with the Secretary a single set of assurances, applicable to each program included in the consolidated application, that provide that --

1. Each such program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications;
2. The control of funds provided under each such program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency, a nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or an Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; and
3. The public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or Indian tribe will administer those funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing law;
4. The State will adopt and use proper methods of administering each such program, including—

- a. The enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program;
 - b. The correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation; and
 - c. The adoption of written procedures for the receipt and resolution of complaints alleging violations of law in the administration of the programs;
5. The State will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the Secretary or other Federal officials;
 6. The State will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under each such program;
 7. The State will—
 - a. Make reports to the Secretary as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to perform the Secretary's duties under each such program; and
 - b. Maintain such records, provide such information to the Secretary, and afford such access to the records as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the Secretary's duties; and
 - c. Before the plan or application was submitted to the Secretary, the State afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the plan or application and considered such comment.

Certification

Certification of compliance with Unsafe School Choice Option Requirements

The State certifies that it has established and implemented a statewide policy requiring that students attending persistently dangerous public elementary or secondary schools, as determined by the State (in consultation with a representative sample of local educational agencies), or who become victims of violent criminal offenses, as determined by State law, while in or on the grounds of public elementary and secondary schools that the students attend, be allowed to attend safe public elementary or secondary schools within the local educational agency, including a public charter school.

ESEA Program Specific Assurances

Each SEA that submits a consolidated application also must provide an assurance that it will comply with all requirements of the ESEA programs included in their consolidated applications, whether or not the program statute identifies these requirements as a description or assurance that States would address, absent this consolidated application, in a program-specific plan or application. States are required to maintain records of their compliance with each of those requirements. (Note: For the Safe and Drug Free Schools programs, the SEA must have all appropriate assurances from the Governor on record.)

Through the general assurance and assurance (1) in section 9304 (a), the SEA agrees to comply with all requirements of the ESEA and other applicable program statutes. While all requirements are important, we have identified below a number of key requirements of each program that the SEA is agreeing to meet through this general assurance. This list

of program-specific requirements the SEA is assuring is not exhaustive; States are accountable for all program requirements.

1. Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs

Assurance that –

- a. The State plan for the implementation of Title I, Part A was developed in consultation with LEAs, teachers, principals, pupil services personnel, administrators, other staff and parents and that the plan for Title I, Part A coordinates with other programs under this Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
- b. The SEA has a plan for assisting LEAs and schools to develop capacity to comply with program operation and for providing additional educational assistance to students needing help to achieve State standards, including:
 - i. the use of schoolwide programs;
 - ii. steps to ensure that both schoolwide program- and targeted assisted program schools have highly qualified staff (section 1111);
 - iii. ensuring that assessments results are used by LEAs, schools, and teachers to improve achievement (section 1111);
 - iv. use of curricula aligned with state standards (section 1111);
 - v. provision of supplemental services, including a list of approved service providers and standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of services (section 1116);
 - vi. choice and options (section 1116);
 - vii. the state support system under section 1117; and
 - viii. teacher and paraprofessional qualifications (section 1119).
- c. The State has a strategy for ensuring that children served by Title I, Part A will be taught the same knowledge and skills in other subjects and held to the same expectations as all children.
- d. The State will implement the accountability requirements of section 1116(f) regarding schools identified for improvement prior to the passage of NCLB.
- e. The State will implement the provisions of section 1116 regarding LEAs and schools in improvement and corrective action.
- f. The State will produce and disseminate an annual State Report Card in accordance with section 1111(h)(1) and will ensure that LEAs that receive Title I, Part A funds produce and disseminate annual local Report Cards in accordance with section 1111(h)(2).
- g. The SEA will ensure that LEAs will annually assess English skills for all limited-English proficient students.
- h. The SEA will coordinate with other agencies that provide services to children, youth and families to address factors that have significantly affected the achievement of students.
- i. The SEA will ensure that assessment results are promptly provided to LEAs, schools, and teachers.

- j. The State will participate in State academic assessments of 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics under NAEP if the Secretary pays the cost of administering such assessments, and will ensure that schools drawn for the NAEP sample will participate in all phases of these assessments, including having results published.
- k. The SEA, in consultation with the Governor, will produce a plan for carrying out the responsibilities of the State under sections 1116 and 1117, and the SEA's statewide system for technical assistance and support of LEAs.
- l. The SEA will assist LEAs in developing or identifying high-quality curricula aligned with State academic achievement standards and will disseminate such curricula to each LEA and local school within the State.
- m. The State will carry out the assurances specified in section 1111(c).

1. Title I, Part B – Even Start Family Literacy

Assurance that –

- a. The SEA will meet its indicators of program quality developed in section 1240.
- b. The SEA will help each project under this part to fully implement the program elements described in section 1235, including the monitoring of the projects' compliance with staff qualification requirements and usage of instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research for children and adults.
- c. The SEA collaborated with early childhood specialists, adult education specialists, and others at the State and local level with interests in family literacy in the development and implementation of this plan.

2. Title I, Part C – Education of Migrant Children

Assurance that –

In addition to meeting the seven program assurances in Section 1304(c), the SEA will ensure that –

- a. Special educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children, are identified and addressed through – (a) the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs; (b) joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migrant children, including language instruction educational programs under part A or B of title III; and (c) the integration of services available under this part with services provided by those other programs, a (d) measurable program goals and outcomes.
- b. State and its local operating agencies will identify and address the special educational needs of migratory children in accordance with a comprehensive State plan as specified in section 1306 (a).
- c. State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records in a manner consistent with procedures the Secretary may require.

4. Title I, Part D – Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk

Assurance that the SEA –

- a. Will ensure that programs will be carried out in accordance with the State plan.
- b. Will carry out the evaluation requirements of section 1431.
- c. Has collaborated with parents, correctional facilities, local education agencies, public and private business and other state and federal technical and vocational programs in developing and implementing its plan to meet the educational needs of neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth.
- d. Conducts a process to award Subpart 2 subgrants, to programs operated by local education agencies and correctional facilities.
- e. Will integrate programs and services for neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth with other programs under this Act or other Acts.

5. Title I, Part F – Comprehensive School Reform

Assurance that the SEA will --

- a. Fulfill all requirements relating to the competitive subgranting of program funds.
- b. Awards subgrants of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support the initial costs of the program.
- c. Award subgrants renewable for 2 additional one year periods if the school is making substantial progress.
- d. Consider the equitable distribution of subgrants to different geographic regions in the State, including urban and rural areas and to schools serving elementary and secondary students.
- e. Reserve not more than five (5) percent of grant funds for administrative, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.
- f. Use funds to supplement, and not supplant, any other funds that would otherwise be available to carry out these activities.
- g. Report subgrant information, including names of LEAs and schools, amount of award, and description of award.
- h. Provide a copy of the State's annual program evaluation.

6. Title II, Part A – Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

Assurance that –

- a. The SEA will take steps to ensure compliance with the requirements for “professional development” as the term is defined in section 9101(34).
- b. All funded activities will be developed collaboratively and based on the input of teachers, principals, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel.

- c. The SEA will implement the provisions for technical assistance and accountability in section 2141 with regard to any LEA that has failed to make adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years.

7. Title II, Part D – Enhanced Education Through Technology

Assurance that the SEA--

- a. Will ensure that each subgrant awarded under section 2412 (a)(2)(B) is of sufficient size and duration, and that the program funded by the subgrant is of sufficient scope and quality, to carry out the purposes of this part effectively.
- b. Has in place a State Plan for Educational Technology that meets all of the provisions of section 2413 of ESEA.

8. Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

Assurance that--

- a. Subgrantees will be required to use their subgrants to build their capacity to continue to provide high-quality language instruction educational programs for LEP students once the subgrants are no longer available.
- b. The State will consult with LEAs, education-related community groups and non-profit organizations, parents, teachers, school administrators, and researchers in developing annual measurable student achievement objectives for subgrantees.
- c. Each subgrantee will include in its plan a certification that all teachers in a Title III language instruction educational program for limited English proficient children are fluent in English and any other language used for instruction.
- d. In awarding subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a recent significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant students, the State will equally consider eligible entities that have limited or no experience in serving immigrant children and youth, and consider the quality of each local plan.
- e. Subgrants will be of sufficient size and scope to support high-quality programs.
- f. Subgrantees will be required to provide for an annual reading or language arts assessment in English of all children who have been in the United States for three or more consecutive years.
- g. Subgrantees will be required to assess annually the English proficiency of all LEP children.
- h. A subgrantee plan will not be in violation of any State law, including State constitutional law, regarding the education of LEP children.
- i. Subgrantee evaluations will be used to determine and improve the effectiveness of subgrantee programs and activities.
- j. Subgrantee evaluations will include a description of the progress made by children in meeting State academic content and student academic achievement

standards for each of the two years after these children no longer participate in a Title III language instruction educational program.

- k. A subgrantee that fails to make progress toward meeting annual measurable achievement objectives for two consecutive years will be required to develop an improvement plan that will ensure the subgrantee meets those objectives.
- l. Subgrantees will be required to provide the following information to parents of LEP children selected for participation in a language instruction educational program:
 - 1) How the program will meet the educational needs of their children;
 - 2) Their options to decline to enroll their children in that program or to choose another program, if available;
 - 3) If applicable, the failure of the subgrantee to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives for their children.
- m. In awarding subgrants, the State will address the needs of school systems of all sizes and in all geographic areas within the State, including school systems with urban and rural schools.

9. Title IV, Part A – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Assurance that--

- a. The State has developed a comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the State educational agency and the chief executive officer of the State to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that complement and support activities of local educational agencies under section 4115(b), that comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a), and that otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of this part.
- b. Activities funded under this program will foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
- c. The application was developed in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials and others, including the chief executive officer, the chief State school officer, the head of the State alcohol and drug abuse agency, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies, the head of the State child welfare agency, the head of the State board of education, or their designees, and representatives of parents, students, and community-based organizations.
- d. Funds reserved under section 4112(a) will not duplicate the efforts of the State education agency and local educational agencies with regard to the provisions of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and that those funds will be used to serve populations not normally served by the State educational agencies and local educational agencies and populations that need special services, such as school dropouts, suspended and expelled students, youth in detention centers, runaway or homeless children and youth, and pregnant and parenting youth.

- e. The State will cooperate with, and assist, the Secretary in conducting data collection as required by section 4122.
- f. LEAs in the State will comply with the provisions of section 9501 pertaining to the participation of private school children and teachers in the programs and activities under this program.
- g. Funds under this program will be used to increase the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of funds under this subpart, be made available for programs and activities authorized under this program, and in no case supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds.
- h. A needs assessment was conducted by the State for drug and violence prevention programs, which shall be based on ongoing State evaluation activities, including data on the incidence and prevalence of illegal drug use and violence among youth in schools and communities, including the age of onset, the perception of health risks, and the perception of social disapproval among such youth, the prevalence of protective factors, buffers, or assets and other variables in the school and community identified through scientifically based research.
- i. The State will develop and implement procedures for assessing and publicly reporting progress toward meeting the performance measures.
- j. The State application will be available for public review after submission of the application.
- k. Special outreach activities will be carried out by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to maximize the participation of community-based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness that provide services such as mentoring programs in low-income communities.
- l. Funds will be used by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to support, develop, and implement community-wide comprehensive drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities.
- m. The State will develop a process for review of applications from local educational agencies that includes receiving input from parents.

10. Title IV, Part B – 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Assure that the SEA will–

- a. Write the State application in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials, including the chief State school officer, and other State agencies administering before and after school programs, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies or their designees, and representatives of teachers, parents, students, the business community, and community-based organizations.
- b. Award subgrants of not less than three years and not more than five years that are of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support high quality, effective programs.
- c. Fund entities that propose to serve students who primarily attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under section 1114 or schools that serve a

high percentage of students from low-income families, and the families of such students.

- d. Require local applicants to submit a plan describing how community learning centers to be funded through this grant will continue after the grant period.
- e. Require local applicants to describe in their applications how the transportation needs of participating students will be addressed.

11. Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs

Assure that--

- a. The State has set forth the allocation of funds required to implement section 5142 (participation of children enrolled in private schools).
- b. The State has made provision for timely public notice and public dissemination of the information concerning allocations of funds required to implement provisions for assistance to students attending private schools.
- c. Apart from providing technical and advisory assistance and monitoring compliance with this part, the SEA has not exercised, and will not exercise, any influence in the decision making processes of LEAs as to the expenditure made pursuant to the LEAs’ application for program funds submitted under section 5133.

Montana Office of Public Instruction Appendix
Compliance Agreement Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Between the United States Department of education and the Montana Office of Public Instruction
State of Montana Request for Proposal
Memorandum for ESEA Unsafe School Choice Option
Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) Program Local Application
Scoring Rubrics for CSR
CSR Evaluation
21 st Century Community Learning Center DRAFT Application
Common Assurances for Federal Programs
Nonpublic School Participation

COMPLIANCE AGREEMENT
UNDER TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AND THE MONTANA OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Introduction

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I) required each State, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, to develop or adopt, by the 1997-98 school year, challenging content standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that describe what the State expects all students to know and be able to do and achievement standards, aligned with those content standards, that describe three levels of proficiency to determine how well students are mastering the content standards. By the 2000-2001 school year, Title I required each State to develop or adopt a set of student assessments in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that would be used to determine the yearly performance of schools and school districts in enabling students to meet the State's achievement standards.

The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) was not able to meet these requirements by the statutory deadlines. In order to be eligible to continue to receive Title I funds while working to comply with the statutory requirements, Linda H. McCulloch, Montana Superintendent of Public Instruction, indicated OPI's interest in entering into a compliance agreement with the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) of the United States Department of Education. On December 10, 2001, OESE conducted a public hearing regarding OPI's ability to come into compliance with the Title I standards and assessment requirements within three years. Based on testimony at that hearing, the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education (Assistant Secretary) determined that compliance by OPI with the Title I standards and assessment requirements was genuinely not feasible until a future date because of the "magnitude and complexity of meeting those requirements." The Assistant Secretary also determined that a compliance agreement represents a viable means of bringing about compliance because of steps OPI has already taken to address its noncompliance, its commitment of resources and the action steps it has developed as set forth below. The Assistant Secretary's written findings are attached to, and incorporated by reference into, this Agreement.

Pursuant to this Compliance Agreement under 20 U.S.C. § 1234f, OPI must be in full compliance with the requirements of Title I no later than three years from the effective date of this Agreement. Specifically, OPI must meet, and document that it has met, the following requirements:

1. Complete development of performance standards by aligning performance descriptors to Montana's content standards and set cut scores on the assessments that define levels of performance.

2. Develop or select an academic assessment system that represents the full range of Montana's content standards and performance standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics consistent with the Title I requirements for use of multiple measures of student achievement, including measures that assess higher-order thinking and understanding. Document the alignment of the assessment system with Montana's content and student performance standards.

3. Document that all students are included in the assessment system, particularly limited English proficient students and students with disabilities. Include test results for all students in school accountability measures. Monitor school-level decisions regarding inclusion of all students in the assessment system.

4. All assessments used in the State for Title I accountability must meet commonly accepted professional standards for technical quality consistent with the uses made of the results. For the Alternate Assessment Scale, Montana must provide evidence of technical quality.

5. Develop and disseminate individual student interpretive and descriptive reports. Report assessment results for the state, each district, and school that are disaggregated by all required categories.

6. Meet requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 related to assessments and accountability.

During the period that this Compliance Agreement is in effect, OPI is eligible to receive Title I, Part A funds if it complies with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, as well as the provisions of Title I, Part A and other applicable Federal statutory and regulatory requirements. Specifically, the Compliance Agreement sets forth below the action steps OPI must meet to come into compliance with the Title I standards and assessment requirements. OPI must submit documentation concerning its compliance with these action steps.

The action steps are listed in the attached table entitled "Action Plan" and are incorporated into this Compliance Agreement; the action steps may be amended by joint agreement of the parties, provided full compliance can still be accomplished by the expiration date of the Agreement.

In addition to all of the terms and conditions set forth above, OPI agrees that its continued eligibility to receive Title I, Part A funds is predicated upon compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements of that program that have not been addressed by this Agreement, including the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Montana Compliance Agreement – Page 3

If OPI fails to comply with any of the terms and conditions of this Compliance Agreement, including the action steps, the Department may consider the Agreement no longer in effect and may take any action authorized by law, including the withholding of funds or the issuance of a cease and desist order. 20 U.S.C. §1234f(d).

The effective date of this Agreement shall be April 5, 2002, and this Agreement shall expire no later than April 5, 2005.

For the Montana Office of Public Instruction:

Linda H. McCulloch
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Date

For the United States Department of Education:

Susan B. Neuman, Ed.D.
Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education

Date

COMPLIANCE AGREEMENT
 UNDER TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
 BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND
 THE MONTANA OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

ACTION PLAN

REQUIREMENT 1 - Complete development of performance standards by aligning performance descriptors to Montana’s content standards and set cut scores on the assessments that define levels of performance. [Performance Standards]

Action Steps for Requirement 1	Completion Date	Evidence	Office Responsible	Fiscal Resources
Describe the process to be used for developing performance standards in reading and math; including procedures for setting cut scores.	June 30, 2002	Work plan	Assessment Office Title I Office	Title II, Title VI
Review the previously state approved performance descriptors and levels with an external consultant leading Montana educators through the process. The process will validate alignment to content standards with revisions as necessary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review existing labels for four performance levels. - Include broad-based groups of Montana educators (including experts in special education and LEP) in the review and revision of performance descriptors for each level to align with each content standard and benchmark for each grade. 	August 31, 2002	New document demonstrating the performance levels and descriptors Documentation of alignment with content standards	Assessment Office Title I Office Accreditation Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI; Special Education
Complete a review to ensure alignment of performance descriptors with content standards and assessments considering comprehensiveness, emphasis, and depth. Ensure that specificity of skills identified for the performance descriptors are sufficiently detailed for subsequent work in augmenting the CRTs, revising the Alternate Assessment Scale, and establishing cut scores.	September 30, 2002	Documentation of alignment of performance descriptors with content standards and assessments	Assessment Office Title I Office Accreditation Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI; Special Education

Review performance descriptors based on results of the pilot test administration of assessments (including the revised Alternate Assessment Scale). Set preliminary cut scores on assessments by applying generally accepted standards and procedures.	August 31, 2003	Preliminary cut scores based on performance levels and descriptors	Assessment Office Title I Office Accreditation Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI
Review performance descriptors based on results of first full administration of assessments. Set final cut scores on assessments by applying generally accepted standards and procedures.	July 31, 2004	Final cut scores based on performance levels and descriptors	Assessment Office Title I Office Accreditation Office	Title VI
Documentation that the state has formally approved the performance cut scores.	August 31, 2004	Letter with the approval date provided by the State Superintendent to ED	Assessment Office Title I Office Accreditation Office	Title VI
Document how performance standards are aligned with the content standards, are challenging for all students, were developed with broad-based involvement, and that all students are held to the same high performance standards.	October 31, 2004	Alignment report, technical manual, list of people that participated in development, and participation rates for all students	Assessment Office Title I Office Accreditation Office	Title VI
Documentation sent to the USED for formal peer review of performance standards, along with entire set of assessment evidence for peer review.	November 30, 2004	Documents shipped, including Superintendent's approval letter	Assessment Office Title I Office Accreditation Office	Title VI

REQUIREMENT 2 - Develop or select an academic assessment system that represents the full range of Montana’s content standards and performance standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics consistent with the Title I requirements for use of multiple measures of student achievement, including measures that assess higher-order thinking and understanding. Document the alignment of the assessment system with Montana’s content and student performance standards. [Full assessment system and alignment]

Action Steps for Requirement 2	Completion Date	Evidence	Office Responsible	Fiscal Resources
Issue a Request for Proposals for an off-the-shelf criterion-referenced test in reading and math for grades 4, 8 & 11.	February 1, 2002	Copy of RFP	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title I, Title II
Form broad-based advisory groups consisting of content area teachers, superintendents, principals, curriculum directors, special educators, state Title III director, and representatives of professional education organizations. Form RFP Evaluation Committee representative of the above, geographic regions, and district size.	March 18, 2002	Letters of invitation and list of advisors and the Evaluation committee members	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title I, Title II
Review by teachers of content area match in proposals submitted by vendors; written advice submitted.	April 5, 2002	Written advice to RFP selection committee	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title I, Title II
Review by other advisors of proposals; written advice submitted.	April 5, 2002	Written advice to RFP selection committee	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title I, Title II
Review of proposals and recommendation by RFP Evaluation committee.	April 10, 2002	Written recommendation to State Procurement Bureau	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title I, Title II
Negotiate and sign a contract for a CRT for Phase 2 of an assessment system for Title I purposes. (MontCAS Phase 2).	April 30, 2002	Signed Contract	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title I, Title II
Conduct an analysis of the alignment of the selected reading and math assessments for grades 4, 8, and 11 with Montana’s standards, identifying any gaps or weaknesses in the alignment. Process to be conducted by external independent consultant(s) as arranged by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL).	June 30, 2002	Report on persons involved, activities, dates, and preliminary findings	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title I, Title II, NWREL resources

Report on alignment study for reading and math, grades 4, 8, and 11.	August 31, 2002	Report of alignment study	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title I, Title II, NWREL resources
Develop items to fill gaps in alignment for reading and math, grades 4, 8, and 11 utilizing content standards and revised performance descriptors to ensure that higher order thinking skills are included.	December 31, 2002	Test items map and specifications	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Develop procedures for pilot test administration, scoring, and data analysis.	January 31, 2003	Testing Procedures Document	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Conduct item try-outs for reading and math, grades 4, 8, and 11 using an empirical sample.	February 28, 2003	Analysis of new item performance	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Complete review of these test items for bias to ensure that results measure the essence of the standards and do so for students of diverse backgrounds.	March 31, 2003	Results of item analyses (DIF)	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Conduct inservice for district test coordinators for pilot administration.	April 30, 2003	Schedule of training	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Administer pilot tests in reading and math, grades 4, 8, and 11 including new added items.	May 31, 2003	Pilot test schedule	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Complete any needed adjustments in the test forms and administration procedures for new tests in reading and math, grades 4, 8, and 11.	December 31, 2003	Report adjustments made	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Conduct inservice for district test coordinators for full administration.	March 31, 2004	Schedule of training	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
First full administration of new tests in reading and math, grades 4, 8, and 11 with the additional new items.	April 30, 2004	Schedule for testing	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Set Performance Standards (see details under Requirement 1 above).	August 31, 2004			
Submit assessment system to USED for peer review.	October 31, 2004	Documents shipped, including Superintendent's approval letter	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI

REQUIREMENT 3 - Document that all students are included in the assessment system, particularly limited English proficient students and students with disabilities. Include test results for all students in school accountability measures. Monitor school-level decisions regarding inclusion of all students in the assessment system. [Inclusion]

Action Steps for Requirement 3	Completion Date	Evidence	Office Responsible	Fiscal Resources
Investigate the appropriate accommodations for LEP students (linguistically appropriate) and for students with disabilities to determine the practicality of those accommodations for the CRT.	September 30, 2002	List and description of accommodations for the CRT	Assessment Office Title I Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI Special Education Title III
Review and refine as necessary previously developed policies for including students with disabilities in the statewide assessment system. Revise and refine as necessary/reissue Guidance Document, as necessary.	November 30, 2002	Guidance Document and Policies	Assessment Office Title I Office Special Education Office	Title VI Special Education
Review and refine as necessary previously developed policies for including LEP students in the statewide assessment system. Revise and refine as necessary/reissue Guidance Document, as necessary.	November 30, 2002	Guidance Document and Policies	Assessment Office Title I Office Bilingual Office	Title VI Title III
Develop statewide monitoring procedures to ensure the inclusion of all students.	November 30, 2003	Monitoring procedures	Assessment Office Title I Office Bilingual Office Special Education Office	Title VI Title III Special Education
Complete technical studies and manual for Alternate Assessment Scales.	August 31, 2004	Technical Manual	Assessment Office Title I Office Bilingual Office Special Education Office	Title VI Special Education
Complete technical studies and manual for accommodating LEP students in the state assessments.	August 31, 2004	Technical Manual	Assessment Office Title I Office	Title VI Title III Special

			Bilingual Office Special Education Office	Education
Document that all students are included in the assessment system, especially LEP and students with disabilities.	August 31, 2004	Participation rates	Assessment Office Title I Office Bilingual Office Special Education Office Measurement and Accountability Office	Title VI Title III Special Education

REQUIREMENT 4 – All assessments used in the State for Title I accountability must meet commonly accepted professional standards for technical quality consistent with the uses made of the results. For the Alternate Assessment Scale, Montana must provide evidence of technical quality. [Technical Quality]

Action Steps for Requirement 4	Completion Date	Evidence	Office Responsible	Fiscal Resources
Establish a Technical Advisory Panel consisting of external experts. The primary purpose of the panel is to provide technical advice and assistance. Panel will meet quarterly.	May 31, 2002	List of panel members	Title I Office Assessment Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI, Special Education
Conduct preliminary technical quality analyses of the pilot of the CRT and the revised AAS, consistent with requirements under USED Peer Review Guidance.	August 31, 2003	Technical reports and report of the Technical Advisory Panel	Title I Office Assessment Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI, Special Education
Make any necessary adjustments to the CRT and AAS based on the findings from the review of the technical reports by the Technical Advisory Panel.	December 31, 2003	Confirmation of changes made to the assessments	Title I Office Assessment Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI, Special Education
Conduct technical quality analyses of the first full administration of the CRT (and the AAS, if necessary).	July 31, 2004	Technical reports and report of the Technical Advisory Panel	Title I Office Assessment Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI, Special Education
Complete all technical reports for the CRT and AAS.	August 31, 2004	Technical reports/manuals	Title I Office Assessment Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI, Special Education

Provide evidence of technical quality to USED for peer review.	November 30, 2004	Technical manuals	Title I Office Assessment Office Special Education Office Bilingual Office	Title VI, Special Education
--	-------------------	-------------------	---	-----------------------------

REQUIREMENT 5 - Develop and disseminate individual student interpretive and descriptive reports. Report assessment results for the state, each district, and school that are disaggregated by all required categories. [Reporting]

Action Steps for Requirement 5	Completion Date	Evidence	Office Responsible	Fiscal Resources
Design a reporting template that has all required categories of disaggregated students by achievement level.	November 30, 2003	Sample report	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Design and provide a reporting template for school, district, and state profiles that clearly communicates to educators, parents and stakeholders how the assessments relate to the content and achievement standards.	November 30, 2003	Sample report	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Design an individual student interpretive and descriptive report that is understandable for all parents.	November 30, 2003	Sample report	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Describe the procedures for reporting the performance of small schools, small student subgroups, and K-3 schools.	December 31, 2003	Written procedures	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Document that the state provides school, district, and state reports disaggregated by all required categories.	August 31, 2004	Actual reports that are disseminated and posted on the website	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Document that the state provides individual information from the State assessment showing how well each student has performed relative to the content and performance standards.	August 31, 2004	Actual reports that are disseminated	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Document that LEAs publicize and disseminate the profiles to all the required audiences in a language and format that is understandable to all to the extent practicable.	August 31, 2004	Actual Profiles disseminated by LEAs	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Description of the state's monitoring process to ensure the quality of all reports.	September 30, 2004	Actual Monitoring document	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
Submit manuals and/or guidelines on the interpretation of these reports with the entire assessment system for peer review.	October 31, 2004	Actual Manuals or Guidelines	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI

REQUIREMENT 6 - Meet requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act related to assessments and accountability. [NCLB assessment and accountability requirements]

NOTE: Montana will need to modify the contents of reports temporarily until all required assessment components are implemented.

Action Steps for Requirement 6	Completion Date	Documentation	Office Responsible	Fiscal Resources
<p>These action steps are goals to be accomplished by the date shown. Montana, and other Compliance agreement States, will have until 6 months from the date of the agreement or 30 days after publication of final regulations (whichever comes first) to determine the specific tasks and dates required to satisfy each goal.</p> <p>Content standards in science: <i>Completed for grades 4, 8, and 11 and adopted by State Board of Education</i></p>	October 1999	Administrative Rules of Montana	Accreditation office	State
<p>Develop standards-based assessments reading and math in remaining grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 Complete alignment study of purchased criterion-referenced test</p> <p>Draft & field test items Pilot assessments in the grades not tested in 2004</p> <p>Full Administration of reading and math in grades 3,5,6, and 7 (along with grades 4, 8, and 11)</p>	<p>November 30, 2003 April 30, 2004 April 30, 2005 April 30, 2006</p>	<p>Report of alignment</p> <p>Field test data Pilot administration manual Schedule for testing; tests given as scheduled</p>	Title I Office Assessment Office	Title VI
<p>Dissemination of disaggregated data at the school and district levels from the assessments currently in use. Assessment reports to include: gender, major racial/ethnic groups, English proficiency status, migrant status, students with disabilities as compared to nondisabled students, and economically disadvantaged students as compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged</p>	<p>Aug 31, 2002 (as available) Aug 31, 2003 (all subgroups) AND Annually thereafter</p>	<p>Reports based on ITBS/ITED tests administered in 2001-02.</p>	Title I Office Assessment Office Measurement and Accountability Office	Title VI

economically disadvantaged.				
Distribution of an itemized score analysis to support instructional improvement.	Aug 31, 2003 AND Annually thereafter	Sample report based on test administered in 2001-02	Title I Office Assessment Office Measurement and Accountability Office	Title VI
Implementation of the English language proficiency testing required under Title I and Title III <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify test(s) that will be used Administer to all LEP students Define annual measurable objectives for gains in English proficiency as required in Sec. 3122 Report results as required by NCLB 	2002-03 AND Annually thereafter	Instructions to districts and schools, test administration manuals, sample reports	Title I Office Assessment Office Title III Office	Title VI; Title III
Participation in the National Assessment of Educational Progress in 2003 and 2005 and, if selected, participation in the field test in off-years	May 28, 2002	Documented in Consolidated Application	Assessment office	ED/NAEP
Distribution of a state report card as required under Section 1111 of Title I. State report card must include the following assessment components by dates shown <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disaggregated student achievement results by performance level by Sept 30, 2002 Percent of students not tested, disaggregated by Aug 31, 2003 Comparison between annual objectives and actual performance for each student group by Aug 31, 2004 <p>All other report card requirements must be met as quickly as possible, consistent with implementation of final assessments.</p>	See deadlines for each item	Copy of state report card Copy of state report card Copy of state report card	Title I Office Assessment Office Measurement and Accountability Office	Title VI
A. Continued identification of schools in need of improvement, based on data from the current assessment(s) for all children in the grades assessed and, to also include:		Description of school accountability	Title I Office Measurement and	Title I; Title VI

<p>the grades assessed and, to also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance of subgroups (of statistically reliable size) • Application of the 95% participation rule • HS graduation and the other indicators required by NCLB, <p>B. Establish AYP baseline, based on data from the new assessment(s) for all children in the grades assessed Use transitional rules under NCLB, Sec. 1116 to identify schools in need of improvement</p>	<p>Sept 30, 2002 (as available) Aug 31, 2003</p> <p>Aug 31, 2004</p>	<p>system, to include the data source (assessments) and formula or decision sequence used to determine school classifications.</p> <p>List of schools & districts identified for improvement</p> <p>Communication of baseline values and AYP design to schools and districts</p> <p>List of schools & districts identified for improvement</p>	<p>Accountability Office</p> <p>Title I Office Measurement and Accountability Office Assessment Office Accreditation Office</p>	<p>Title I; Title VI; State</p>
<p>Annual report to the Secretary as described in Section 1111(h)(4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on State progress in developing all required academic assessments (2002-03) • Student achievement data, disaggregated (2002-03) • Data on acquisition of English proficiency by LEP (2002-03) • Number and names of schools identified for school improvement, the reason for identification, and measures taken to address achievement problems • Number of students and schools that participated in public school choice and supplemental services • Information on quality of teachers and percent of classes taught by highly qualified (2002-03) 	<p>Aug 2002 and annually thereafter</p>	<p>Data will be reported as part of the Annual Title I Performance Report</p>	<p>Title I Office Measurement and Accountability Office Assessment Office</p>	<p>Title I; Title VI; State</p>
<p>All other requirements of NCLB pertaining to schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring during the period of the compliance agreement</p>	<p>2002-03</p>	<p>Implementation and documentation of choice,</p>	<p>Title I Office</p>	<p>Title I; Title VI; State</p>

		supplemental services, corrective actions, as appropriate		
--	--	---	--	--

BUDGET FOR ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Year 1: April 2002 – June 2002

Title I:	20,000
Title II, special one time appropriation:	58,000
Special Education:	25,000
Title III:	10,000

Year 2: July 2002 – June 2003

Federal Funds for Assessment Under Title VI of P.L. 107-110:	3.6 million
Special Education:	25,000
Title III:	10,000

Year 3: July 2003 – June 2004

Title VI:	3 million
Special Education:	25,000
Title III:	10,000

Year 4: July 2004 – April 2005

Title VI:	3 million
-----------	-----------

STATE OF MONTANA REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

Department of Administration
State Procurement Bureau
Room 165, Mitchell Building
PO Box 200135
125 North Roberts Street
Helena MT 59620-0135
Phone: (406)444-2575 Fax: (406)444-2529
www.discoveringmontana.com/doa/ppd

Company Name/Address: (correct any errors)

RFP No.: 02-369J

RFP Title:

**Montana Comprehensive Assessment
System, Phase 2 Criterion-Referenced Tests
in Reading, Math, and Science**

Pages: 1-27, Appendices A through I

SEALED PROPOSALS will be accepted until 2
p.m. on:

March 15, 2002

Issued by:

JEANNE WOLF, Contracts Officer

**MARK FACE OF THE PROPOSAL ENVELOPE UNDER
YOUR RETURN ADDRESS WITH THE FOLLOWING:**

**RFP#02-369J
3/15/02**

RETURN YOUR PROPOSAL TO:

**Department of Administration
State Procurement Bureau
Room 165, Mitchell Building
125 North Roberts Street
PO Box 200135
Helena MT 59620-0135**

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

PLEASE COMPLETE

Federal I.D.
No.:

Payment Terms: Net 30 Days

Company Name/Address: (if different)

Offeror Name: (please print)

E-mail Address:

Phone: ()

Fax: ()

Signature of
Offeror:

**IMPORTANT
SEE STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

Standard Terms and Conditions

By submitting a bid, proposal, or limited solicitation, or acceptance of a contract, the vendor agrees to the following binding provisions:

ACCEPTANCE/REJECTION OF BIDS, PROPOSALS, OR LIMITED SOLICITATION RESPONSES: The State reserves the right to accept or reject any or all bids, proposals, or limited solicitation responses, wholly or in part, and to make awards in any manner deemed in the best interest of the State. Bids, proposals, and limited solicitation responses will be firm for 30 days, unless stated otherwise in the text of the invitation for bid, request for proposal, or limited solicitation.

ACCESS AND RETENTION OF RECORDS: The contractor agrees to provide the department, Legislative Auditor, or their authorized agents, access to any records necessary to determine contract compliance (Mont. Code Ann. § 18-1-118). The contractor agrees to create and retain records supporting the services rendered or supplies delivered for a period of three years after either the completion date of the contract or the conclusion of any claim, litigation, or exception relating to the contract taken by the State of Montana or third party.

ASSIGNMENT, TRANSFER AND SUBCONTRACTING: The contractor shall not assign, transfer or subcontract any portion of the contract without the express written consent of the department. (Mont. Code Ann. § 18-4-141.)

AUTHORITY: The following bid, request for proposal, limited solicitation, or contract is issued in accordance with Title 18, Montana Code Annotated, and the Administrative Rules of Montana, Title 2, chapter 5.

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY TO TRANSACT BUSINESS: Any business entity, domestic or foreign, intending to transact business in Montana must apply for authority to do so with the Montana Secretary of State. Foreign business entities are obligated to determine whether they are transacting business in Montana, in accordance with sections 35-1-1026 and 35-8-1001, MCA, and if so, must apply for and receive a certificate of authority and continue to be in good standing with the Secretary of State for the duration of the contract. Violation of these requirements may void the contract. Proof of authority is required. Questions or registration may be accomplished by contacting the Secretary of State at (406) 444-3665 or by e-mail at <http://sos.state.mt.us/css/index.asp>.

COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS: The contractor must, in performance of work under the contract, fully comply with all applicable federal, state, or local laws, rules and regulations, including the Montana Human Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Any subletting or subcontracting by the contractor subjects subcontractors to the same provision. In accordance with section 49-3-207, MCA, the contractor agrees that the hiring of persons to perform the contract will be made on the basis of merit and qualifications and there will be no discrimination based upon race, color, religion, creed, political ideas, sex, age, marital status, physical or mental disability, or national origin by the persons performing the contract.

CONFORMANCE WITH CONTRACT: No alteration of the terms, conditions, delivery, price, quality, quantities, or specifications of the contract shall be granted without prior written consent of the State Procurement Bureau. Supplies delivered which do not conform to the contract terms, conditions, and specifications may be rejected and returned at the contractor's expense.

DEBARMENT: The contractor certifies that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction (contract) by any governmental department or agency. If the contractor cannot certify this statement, attach a written explanation for review by the State.

DISABILITY ACCOMMODATIONS: The State of Montana does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admission to, access to, or operations of its programs, services, or activities. Individuals, who need aids, alternative document formats, or services for effective communications or other disability-related accommodations in the programs and services offered, are invited to make their needs and preferences known to this office. Interested

parties should provide as much advance notice as possible.

FACSIMILE RESPONSES: Facsimile responses will be accepted for invitations for bids or limited solicitations ONLY if they are completely received by the State Procurement Bureau prior to the time set for receipt. Bids, or portions thereof, received after the due time will not be considered. Facsimile responses to requests for proposals are ONLY accepted on an exception basis with prior approval of the procurement officer.

FAILURE TO HONOR BID/PROPOSAL: If a bidder/offeror to whom a contract is awarded refuses to accept the award (PO/contract) or, fails to deliver in accordance with the contract terms and conditions, the department may, in its discretion, suspend the bidder/offeror for a period of time from entering into any contracts with the State of Montana.

HOLD HARMLESS/INDEMNIFICATION: The contractor agrees to protect, defend, and save the State, its elected and appointed officials, agents, and employees, while acting within the scope of their duties as such, harmless from and against all claims, demands, causes of action of any kind or character, including the cost of defense thereof, arising in favor of the contractor's employees or third parties on account of bodily or personal injuries, death, or damage to property arising out of services performed or omissions of services or in any way resulting from the acts or omissions of the contractor and/or its agents, employees, representatives, assigns, subcontractors, except the sole negligence of the State, under this agreement.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY: All patents and other legal rights in or to inventions arising out of activities funded in whole or in part by the contract must be available to the State for royalty-free and nonexclusive licensing. The contractor shall notify the State in writing of any invention conceived or reduced to practice in the course of performance of the contract. The State shall have a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable right to reproduce, publish or otherwise use and authorize others to use, copyrightable property created under the contract.

LATE BIDS AND PROPOSALS: Regardless of cause, late bids and proposals will not be accepted and will automatically be disqualified from further consideration. It shall be solely the vendor's risk to assure delivery at the designated office by the designated time. Late bids and proposals will not be opened and may be returned to the vendor at the expense of the vendor or destroyed if requested.

PAYMENT TERM: All payment terms will be computed from the date of delivery of supplies or services OR receipt of a properly executed invoice, whichever is later. Unless otherwise noted, the State is allowed 30 days to pay such invoices.

RECIPROCAL PREFERENCE: The State of Montana applies a reciprocal preference against a vendor submitting a bid from a state or country that grants a residency preference to its resident businesses. A reciprocal preference is only applied to an invitation for bid for supplies or an invitation for bid for nonconstruction services for public works as defined in section 18-2-401(9), MCA, and then only if federal funds are not involved. For a list of states that grant resident preference, see www.discoveringmontana.com/doa/ppd under Reciprocal Preference.

REFERENCE TO CONTRACT: The contract (Purchase Order) number MUST appear on all invoices, packing lists, packages and correspondence pertaining to the contract.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE: A declaration by any court, or any other binding legal source, that any provision of the contract is illegal and void shall not affect the legality and enforceability of any other provision of the contract, unless the provisions are mutually dependent.

SHIPPING: Supplies shall be shipped prepaid, F.O.B. Destination, unless the contract specifies otherwise.

SOLICITATION DOCUMENT EXAMINATION: Vendors shall promptly notify the State of any ambiguity, inconsistency, or error, which they may discover upon examination of a solicitation document.

TAX EXEMPTION: The State of Montana is exempt from Federal Excise Taxes (#81-0302402).

TECHNOLOGY ACCESS FOR BLIND OR VISUALLY IMPAIRED: Contractor acknowledges that no state funds

may be expended for the purchase of information technology equipment and software for use by employees, program participants, or members of the public unless it provides blind or visually impaired individuals with access, including interactive use of the equipment and services, that is equivalent to that provided to individuals who are not blind or visually impaired. (Mont. Code Ann. § 18-5-603.) Contact the State Procurement Bureau at (406) 444-2575 for more information concerning nonvisual access standards.

TERMINATION OF CONTRACT: Unless otherwise stated, the State may, by written notice to the contractor, terminate the contract in whole or in part at any time the contractor fails to perform the contract.

UNAVAILABILITY OF FUNDING: The contracting agency, at its sole discretion, may terminate or reduce the scope of the contract if available funding is reduced for any reason. (Mont. Code Ann. § 18-4-313 (3).)

U.S. FUNDS: All prices and payments must be in U.S. dollars.

VENUE: This solicitation is governed by the laws of Montana. The parties agree that any litigation concerning this bid, request for proposal, limited solicitation, or subsequent contract, must be brought in the First Judicial District in and for the County of Lewis and Clark, State of Montana, and each party shall pay its own costs and attorney fees. (Mont. Code Ann. § 18-1-401.)

WARRANTIES: The contractor warrants that items offered will conform to the specifications requested, to be fit and sufficient for the purpose manufactured, of good material and workmanship and free from defect. Items offered must be new and unused and of the latest model or manufacture, unless otherwise specified by the State. They shall be equal in quality and performance to those indicated herein. Descriptions used herein are specified solely for the purpose of indicating standards of quality, performance and/or use desired. Exceptions will be rejected.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

FOR

A

**MONTANA COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM, PHASE 2
CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS IN READING, MATH, AND SCIENCE**

FOR THE STATE OF MONTANA

RFP # 02-369J

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Schedule of Events	7
Section 1 - General Information	8
Section 2 - Scope of Project.....	17
Section 3 - Offeror Qualifications	24
Section 4 - Cost Proposal	25
Section 5 - Evaluation Criteria.....	26
Appendix A - Sample Contract	
Appendix B - Format for Match to Montana Content Standards	
Appendix C – Montana Board of Public Education Statement of Purpose for Student Assessment	
Appendix D - <u>Peer Reviewer Guidance for Evaluating Evidence of Final Assessment Systems under Title I</u> , provided by the U.S. Department of Education	
Appendix E - Major steps required in Montana’s federal compliance agreement outline	
Appendix F - Initial detailed Proposed Action Plan for Grades 4, 8, and 11	
Appendix G – "Facts About Montana Education," prepared by the Montana Office of Public Instruction	
Appendix H - Montana Content Standards in reading, mathematics, and science	
Appendix I - Section 18-5-601, MCA (Montana Code Annotated) and Montana Alternate Assessment Scales	

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

<u>Event</u>	<u>Date</u>
RFP Released.....	January 31, 2002
Deadline for Receipt of Written Inquiries.....	February 13, 2002
Written Responses Distributed.....	February 27, 2002
Proposal Due Date.....	March 15, 2002
Notification of Offeror Interviews / Product Demonstrations.....	March 22, 2002
Intended Date for Contract Award.....	April 30, 2002

NOTICE

From the issuance date of this RFP until a Contractor(s) is selected and the selection is announced, offerors are not allowed to communicate with any state staff or officials regarding this procurement, except at the direction of Jeanne Wolf the designated representative of the State Procurement Bureau. Any unauthorized contact may disqualify the offeror from further consideration.

Contracts Officer: Jeanne Wolf
Telephone Number: (406) 444-7210
Fax Number: (406) 444-2529
E-mail Address: jwolf@state.mt.us

SECTION 1

GENERAL INFORMATION

1.0 Introduction

The STATE OF MONTANA, Office of Public Instruction (hereinafter referred to as “the State”) is pleased to invite you to submit a proposal for a Montana Comprehensive Assessment System, Phase 2, specified herein. This project will provide a criterion-referenced test with maximum possible alignment to state content standards in reading and math for grades 3 through 8 and grade 11*. Grades 4, 8, and 11 must be implemented by April 2004 and the other grades by April 2006. The project will also provide a criterion-referenced test in science for grades 4, 8, and 11* with maximum possible alignment to state content standards in science to be implemented no later than April, 2008. The test format may be traditional “paper and pencil” or online with the contractor providing paper and pencil tests when and where necessary for comprehensive administration for all schools and all students to be included. If online format is proposed, accessibility to the internet by all Montana schools will be evaluated as part of the selection process, e.g., low bandwidth versus T1 line requirements. Offerors must describe internet requirements and specifications in their proposals for online format. In addition, proposals will be evaluated on the ability of the computerized tests to adhere to measuring proficiency on the content standards associated with each specific grade level tested instead of individual student ability or achievement levels on an adaptive basis. Proposals submitted in response to the specifications contained herein shall comply with the following instructions and procedures.

***Note:** While grade 11 is used throughout this document, the actual intent is to test one grade in high school. That is currently identified as grade 11, but the actual grade designated for testing could change. This will be addressed as timelines and work plans are refined and developed and must be addressed in case the designated high school grade level must change. Please keep this note in mind throughout the text of this document and all appendices.

1.1 Request for Proposal Standard Information

This Request for Proposal is issued in accordance with section 18-4-304, MCA (Montana Code Annotated) and ARM 2.5.602 (Administrative Rules of Montana). The RFP process is a procurement option allowing the award to be based on stated evaluation criteria. The RFP states the relative importance of all evaluation criteria. No other evaluation criteria, other than as outlined in the Request for Proposal, will be used.

1.1.1 Receipt of Proposals and Public Inspection

Upon receipt of proposals, all marked trade secrets and company financial information will be removed from the proposals and provided only to the evaluation committee members or persons participating in the contracting process (see Section 1.1.7 “Claims to Keep Information Confidential” statement below). All remaining proposal materials will be available for public inspection and copying shortly after the deadline for submission of proposals. In addition, all meetings of the evaluation committee are open to the public for observation.

1.1.2 Initial Classification

All proposals will be initially classified as being responsive or nonresponsive, according to

ARM 2.5.602. If a proposal is found to be nonresponsive, it will not be considered further.

1.1.3 Evaluation

All responsive proposals will be evaluated based on stated evaluation criteria. Submitted proposals must be complete at the time of submission and may not include references to information located elsewhere, such as Internet websites or libraries, unless specifically requested in the state's RFP document.

1.1.4 Discussion/Negotiation

Although proposals may be accepted and a contract awarded without discussion, the State may initiate discussions with one or more offerors should clarification or negotiation be necessary. Offerors should be prepared to send qualified personnel to Helena, Montana, to discuss technical and contractual aspects of the proposal.

1.1.5 Best and Final Offer

The "Best and Final Offer" is an option available to the State under the RFP process which permits the State to request a "best and final offer" from one or more offerors. Offerors may be contacted asking that they submit their best and final offer, which must include the discussed and/or negotiated changes.

1.1.6 Award

Award will be made to the proposal offered by a responsive and responsible offeror which is determined to best meet the evaluation criteria and is therefore the one most advantageous to the State.

1.1.7 Claims to Keep Information Confidential

- (1) All information received in response to this RFP will be available for public inspection except for:
 - (a) trade secrets meeting the requirements of the Uniform Trade Secrets Act, Title 30, chapter 14, part 4, MCA;
 - (b) matters involving individual safety as determined by the department;
 - (c) financial information requested by the department to establish offeror responsibility unless prior written consent has been given by the offeror, as set out in section 18-4-308, MCA; and
 - (d) other constitutional protections.

- (2) In order for an offeror to request that material be kept confidential as permitted in (1) (a) through (d), the following conditions must be met:
 - (a) Confidential information must be clearly marked and separated from the rest of the proposal.
 - (b) The proposal may not contain confidential material in the cost or price.
 - (c) An affidavit from an offeror's legal counsel attesting to and explaining the validity of the trade secret claim as set out in Title 30, chapter 14, part 4, MCA, must be attached to each proposal containing trade secrets. Counsel must use the State of Montana "Affidavit for Trade Secret Confidentiality" in requesting the trade

secret claim. This affidavit form is available at the State Procurement Bureau's website: www.discoveringmontana.com/doa/ppd/tradesecretaffidavit.pdf or by calling (406) 444-2575.

(d) Offerors must be prepared to pay all legal costs and fees associated with defending a claim for confidentiality in the event of a "right to know" (open records) request from another party.

(3) Documents not meeting all of the requirements of (1) and (2) will be available for public inspection, including copyrighted material.

1.2 Late Proposals

Regardless of cause, late proposals will not be accepted and will automatically be disqualified from further consideration. It shall be the offeror's sole risk to assure delivery at the receptionist's desk at the designated office by the designated time. Late proposals will not be opened and may be returned to the offeror at the expense of the offeror or destroyed if requested.

1.3 Preparing a Response

This RFP contains the instructions governing the proposals to be submitted and a description of the mandatory requirements. To be eligible for consideration, an offeror must meet the intent of all mandatory requirements. Compliance with the intent of all requirements will be determined by the Department of Administration. Responses that do not meet the full intent of all requirements listed in this RFP may be subject to point reductions during the evaluation process or may be deemed non-responsive.

1.3.1 Offerors shall promptly notify the State of any ambiguity, inconsistency or error, which they may discover upon examination of this RFP.

1.3.2 Offerors requiring clarification or interpretation of any section or sections contained in this RFP shall make a written request to the State Procurement Bureau by the deadline described in the Schedule of Events. All written correspondence must be addressed to:

Questions for RFP #02-369J
Jeanne Wolf, Contracts Officer
State Procurement Bureau
Room 165, Mitchell Building
125 North Roberts
PO Box 200135
Helena, MT 59620-0135
Fax: (406) 444-2529
E-mail: jwolf@state.mt.us

1.3.2.1 Each offeror submitting written questions must clearly address each question by reference to a specific section, page and item of this RFP. **An official written answer will be provided to all questions received by 2 p.m. (local time) on February 13, 2002.** Written questions received after the deadline may not be considered.

1.3.2.2 Responses to written questions will be posted on the State Procurement Bureau's

website at <http://www.discoveringmontana.com/doa/ppd> on or before **February 27, 2002**.

- 1.3.3 Any interpretation, correction, or change to this RFP will be made by written Addendum. Interpretations, corrections or changes to this RFP made in any other manner will not be binding and offerors shall not rely upon such interpretations, corrections, or changes.
- 1.3.4 The State Procurement Bureau, Department of Administration, State of Montana will issue any necessary Addenda.
- 1.3.5 Offerors must organize proposals into sections following the format of this RFP, with tabs separating each section. The evaluation committee will be looking for the following specific responses from each offeror in the quantities requested in Section 1.4 below, **an original and 11 copies**:

Part 1 – A point-by-point response to all the numbered paragraphs in Sections 1, 2, and 3. If no exception, explanation, or clarification is required in the offeror's response to a specific subsection, the offeror shall indicate so in the point-by-point response with the following:

“(Offeror’s Name)”, understands and will comply.

Points may be subtracted for non-compliance with these specified proposal format requests. The State may also choose to not evaluate, may deem non-responsive, and/or may disqualify from further consideration any proposals that do not follow this RFP format, are difficult to understand, are difficult to read, or are missing any requested information.

An Offeror responding to a question with a response similar to, “Refer to our literature...” or “Please see [www.....com](#)” may be deemed non-responsive or receive point deductions. All materials related to a response must be submitted to the State in the RFP response and not just referenced. Any references in an answer to another location in the RFP materials shall have specific page numbers and sections stated in the reference. Each question is scored independently of one another and the scoring is based solely on the information provided in the response to the specific question. **(The Evaluation Team is not required to search through literature to find a response.)**

Part 2 – Item-Standards Match - the analysis of the match between the State’s content standards in reading and math and the test being offered, using format outlined in Appendix B;

Part 3 – The submission of 11 technical manuals, 11 copies of the tests proposed, and examples of support materials being proposed.

Part 4 – The submission of a cost proposal that ranges from \$1.5 million to \$2.5 million (corresponds to Section 4 of RFP).

The State is desirous of the highest quality products and services possible within the available resources and has established **criteria for reviewing the requests for proposals**. Those criteria include the criteria adopted by the Board of Public

Education for test selection (see Appendix C), additional factors related to vendor qualifications, and criteria in the Peer Reviewer Guidance for Evaluating Evidence of Final Assessment Systems under Title I, provided by the U.S. Department of Education (see Appendix D). All responses to this RFP should be prepared in a straightforward, economical style focusing on concise but complete descriptions and examples of the Offeror's plans and ability to deliver the required products and services.

1.3.6 A test item match to the Montana content standards in reading, math, and science is a major criteria for the award. Therefore, an Item-Standards Match Part 2 response to the proposal requires submission of items-standards matching in the format detailed in Appendix B. A Part 3 response to the proposal requires submission of technical manuals, copies of the tests being proposed, and examples of supportive materials.

1.3.7 Offerors may, at their option, submit multiple proposals, in which case each proposal shall be evaluated as a separate document.

1.4 Submitting a Proposal

Offerors must submit one original and 11 copies to the State Procurement Bureau. **Proposals must be received at the receptionist's desk of the State Procurement Bureau prior to 2 p.m. local time, Friday, March 15, 2002. Proposals received after this time will not be accepted for consideration. Facsimile or electronic submissions are not acceptable. (See Section 1.2.)**

1.4.1 Each offeror who submits a proposal represents that:

1.4.1.1 The proposal is based upon an understanding of the specifications and requirements described in this RFP.

1.4.1.2 Costs for developing and delivering responses to this RFP and any subsequent presentations of the proposal as requested by the State are entirely the responsibility of the offeror. The State is not liable for any expense incurred by the offerors in the preparation and presentation of their proposals.

1.4.1.3 All materials submitted in response to this RFP become the property of the State and are to be appended to any formal documentation, which would further define or expand any contractual relationship between the State and offeror resulting from this RFP process.

1.4.2 The proposals must be signed in ink by an individual authorized to legally bind the business submitting the proposal.

1.4.3 A proposal may not be modified, withdrawn or canceled by the offeror for a 120-day period following the deadline for proposal submission, or receipt of best and final offer, if required, as defined in the Schedule of Events, and offeror so agrees in submitting the proposal.

1.5 Rights Reserved

While the State has every intention to award a contract as a result of this RFP, issuance of the RFP in no way constitutes a commitment by the State of Montana to award a contract. Upon a

determination such actions would be in its best interests, the State in its sole discretion reserves the right to:

- (a) waive any formality;
- (b) cancel or terminate this RFP;
- (c) reject any or all proposals received in response to this document;
- (d) waive any undesirable, inconsequential, or inconsistent provisions of this document, which would not have significant impact on any proposal;
- (e) not award, or if awarded, terminate any contract if the State determines adequate state funds are not available.

1.6 Contract Performance Security – All Forms Accepted

The successful vendor must provide Contract Performance Security based upon 1% of the contract total.

The contract performance security must be provided by the successful vendor in one of the following forms, within 10 working days from the Request for Documents Notice. ONLY THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF SECURITY ARE ACCEPTABLE AND MUST BE IN ORIGINAL FORM. FACSIMILE, ELECTRONIC, OR PHOTOCOPIES ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE.

- (a) a sufficient bond from a surety company licensed in Montana with a Best's rating of no less than A- and supplied on the State of Montana's designated form found at <http://www.discoveringmontana.com/doa/ppd/stst.htm#FI> and entitled "Contract Performance Bond"; or
- (b) lawful money of the United States; or
- (c) an irrevocable letter of credit not to exceed \$100,000 from a single financial institution and supplied on the State of Montana's designated form found at <http://www.discoveringmontana.com/doa/ppd/stst.htm#FI> and entitled "Irrevocable Letter of Credit"; or
- (d) a cashier's check, certified check, bank money order, bank draft, certificate of deposit, or money market certificates drawn or issued by a federally or state-chartered bank or savings and loan association that is insured by or for which insurance is administered by the FDIC or that is drawn and issued by a credit union insured by the national credit union share insurance fund. Certificates of deposit or money market certificates will not be accepted as security for bid, proposal or contract security unless the certificates are assigned only to the State. All interest income from these certificates must accrue only to the contractor and not the State.
- (e) personal or business checks are not acceptable.

This security must remain in effect for the entire contract period. A new surety bond or irrevocable letter of credit must be issued to the State of Montana if this contract is renewed.

The contract security must be provided to the following address: State Procurement Bureau, P.O. Box 200135, Helena, MT 59620-0135.

(See Title 18, chapter 4, part 3, MCA, Title 30, chapter 5, MCA, and ARM 2.5.502.)

1.7 Offeror Interview / Product Demonstration

After receipt of all proposals and prior to the determination of the award, respondents may be required to make an oral presentation and product demonstration in Helena, Montana, to clarify

their response or to further define their offer. Oral presentations and product demonstrations, if requested, shall be at the offeror's expense.

1.8 Subcontracting

The successful offeror will be the prime contractor and shall be responsible, in total, for all work of any subcontractors. All subcontractors must be listed in the proposal. The State reserves the right to approve all subcontractors.

1.8.1 The Contractor shall be responsible to the State for the acts and omissions of all subcontractors or agents and of persons directly or indirectly employed by such subcontractors, and for the acts and omissions of persons employed directly by the Contractor. Further, nothing contained within this document or any contract documents created as a result of any contract awards derived from this RFP shall create any contractual relationships between any subcontractor and the State.

1.9 General Insurance Requirements

General Requirements: The Contractor shall maintain for the duration of the contract, at its cost and expense, insurance against claims for injuries to persons or damages to property, including contractual liability, which may arise from or in connection with the performance of the work by the Contractor, agents, employees, representatives, assigns, or subcontractors. This insurance shall cover such claims as may be caused by any negligent act or omission.

Primary Insurance: The Contractor's insurance coverage shall be primary insurance as respect to the State, its officers, officials, employees, and volunteers and shall apply separately to each project or location. Any insurance or self-insurance maintained by the State, its officers, officials, employees or volunteers shall be excess of the Contractor's insurance and shall not contribute with it.

Specific Requirements for Commercial General Liability: The Contractor shall purchase and maintain occurrence coverage with combined single limits for bodily injury, personal injury, and property damage of \$500,000 per occurrence and \$1,000,000 aggregate per year to cover such claims as may be caused by any act, omission, or negligence of the Contractor or its officers, agents, representatives, assigns or subcontractors.

Additional Insured Status: The State, its officers, officials, employees, and volunteers are to be covered as additional insureds; for liability arising out of activities performed by or on behalf of the Contractor, including the insured's general supervision of the Contractor; products and completed operations; premises owned, leased, occupied, or used.

Deductibles and Self-Insured Retentions: Any deductible or self-insured retention must be declared to and approved by the state agency. At the request of the agency either: (1) the insurer shall reduce or eliminate such deductibles or self-insured retentions as respects the State, its officers, employees, and volunteers; or (2) the Contractor shall procure a bond guaranteeing payment of losses and related investigations, claims administration, and defense expenses.

Certificates of Insurance/Endorsements: Insurance must be placed with an insurer with a Best's rating of no less than A-. The certificate must also include the State's purchase order number or contract number. This insurance must be maintained for the duration of the contract. The State Procurement Bureau, P.O. Box 200135, Helena, MT 59620-0135, must receive all required

certificates and endorsements within 10 days from the date of the Request for Documents notice before a contract or purchase order will be issued. Work may not commence until a contract or purchase order is in place. The Contractor must notify the State immediately, of any material change in insurance coverage, such as changes in limits, coverage, change in status of policy, etc. The State reserves the right to require complete copies of insurance policies at all times.

1.10 Compliance with Workers' Compensation Act

The Contractor is required to supply the State Procurement Bureau, P.O. Box 200135, Helena, MT 59620-0135, with proof of compliance with the Montana Workers' Compensation Act while performing work for the State of Montana. (Mont. Code Ann. §§ 39-71-120, 39-71-401, and 39-71-405.) Neither the Contractor nor its employees are employees of the State. The proof of insurance/exemption must be valid for the entire contract period and must be received by the State Procurement Bureau within 10 working days of the Request for Documents Notice.

CONTRACTS WILL NOT BE ISSUED TO VENDORS WHO FAIL TO PROVIDE THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION WITHIN THE ALLOTTED TIME FRAME.

Coverage may be provided through a private carrier or through the State Compensation Insurance Fund (406) 444-6500. An exemption can be requested through the Department of Labor and Industry, Employment Relations Division (406) 444-1446. Corporate officers must provide documentation of their exempt status.

1.11 Compliance with Laws

The Contractor must, in performance of work under this contract, fully comply with all applicable federal, state, or local laws, rules and regulations, including the Montana Human Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Any subletting or subcontracting by the Contractor subjects subcontractors to the same provision. In accordance with section 49-3-207, MCA, the Contractor agrees that the hiring of persons to perform the contract will be made on the basis of merit and qualifications and there will be no discrimination based upon race, color, religion, creed, political ideas, sex, age, marital status, physical or mental disability, or national origin by the persons performing the contract.

1.12 Offeror Competition

The State encourages free and open competition among offerors. Whenever possible, specifications, proposal requests, and conditions are designed to accomplish this objective, consistent with the necessity to satisfy the State's need to procure technically sound, cost-effective services.

1.12.1 The offeror's signature on a proposal in response to this RFP guarantees that the prices quoted have been established without collusion and without effort to preclude the State of Montana from obtaining the best possible supply or service.

1.13 Contract Provisions and Terms

1.13.1 This RFP and any addenda, the offeror's response including any amendments, any best and final offers, any clarification question responses, and any negotiations shall be included in any resulting contract. Appendix A contains the contract terms and conditions which will form the basis of any contract between the State and the successful offeror. The contract

language contained in Appendix A does not define the total extent of the contract language that may be negotiated. In the event of a dispute as to the duties and responsibilities of the parties under this contract, the contract, along with any attachments prepared by the State, will govern.

- 1.13.2** Offerors should notify the State of any terms within the sample contract that either preclude them from responding to the RFP or add unnecessary cost. This notification must be made by the deadline for receipt of written inquiries.
- 1.13.3** The contract term is for a period of five years, two months beginning April 30, 2002, and ending June 30, 2007. Funding available and terms of contract are contingent upon receipt in July 2002 and subsequent years of federal grant awards under Title VI (State Assessments) of PL107-110, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act enacted January 8, 2002. Continued funding is contingent upon Congressional appropriations under such Act in each year of the authorization of the statute. Renewals of the contract, by mutual agreement of both parties, may be made at one year intervals, or any interval that is advantageous to the State, not to exceed a total of seven years, at the option of the State.
- 1.13.4** Either party may, by written notice, terminate this contract in whole or in part with 30-days notice.
- 1.13.5** Price increases may be permitted at the time of contract renewal through a process of negotiation with the Contractor and the State. Any price increases must be based on demonstrated industry-wide or regional increases in the Contractor's costs. Publications such as the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers may be used to determine the increased value.

SECTION 2

SCOPE OF PROJECT

2.0 Overview of Project

In Montana, accredited schools are currently required by Board of Public Education Rule 10.56.101 to test all students in grades 4, 8, and 11 in reading, mathematics, science, language arts, and social studies in the spring of each year with a norm-referenced test (NRT) provided by the Office of Public Instruction. Those tests currently consist of The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) for grades 4 and 8 and The Iowa Test of Educational Development (ITED) for grade 11. This testing system is known as the Montana Comprehensive Assessment System, Phase 1 (MontCAS Phase 1).

The State seeks a full-service contract to accomplish the project outlined herein. In delivering the contract products and services, the contractor must be able to assist OPI in presentations and communications with policy-setting, decision-making, and legislative bodies. Offerors must describe their approach and ability in providing such a full-service contract. All responses and proposed services and those covered in any subsequent contract must comply with assessment and reporting requirements or other applicable provisions of the following statutes:

Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) of 1997, P.L. 105-17
Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1994, P.L. 103-382
Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 2002, P.L. 107-110
Americans with Disability Act, P.L. 103-336

The State intends to comply with federal requirements under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1994 (PL 103-382) and 2002 (PL 107-110) and fulfill its obligations under a compliance agreement with the U.S. Department of Education by implementing Phase 2 of the Montana Comprehensive Assessment System (MontCAS, Phase 2). See Appendix E for the major steps required in Montana's federal compliance agreement outline. MontCAS Phase 2 will consist of already-developed (off-the-shelf) criterion-referenced tests in reading and math for grades 3-8 and grade 11 that are aligned as closely as possible to the Montana content standards in reading and math. In further fulfilling obligations under PL 107-110 enacted January 8, 2002, the state will add an off-the shelf, criterion-referenced test in science as closely aligned as possible to the Montana content standards in science. Augmentation of these off-the-shelf tests, as described below, is to be included under the contract to be awarded.

The test format may be traditional "paper and pencil" or online with the contractor providing paper and pencil format when and where necessary for administration for all schools, all students to be included. If online format is proposed, accessibility to the internet by all Montana schools (e.g., low bandwidth versus TI line requirements) will be evaluated as part of the selection process. Offerors must describe internet requirements and specifications in their proposals for online format. Also, proposed online formats must be compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act Amendments and section 18-5-601 of the Montana Code Annotated. (See Appendix I.) In addition, proposals will be evaluated on the ability of the computerized tests to adhere to measuring proficiency on the content standards associated with each specific grade level tested instead of individual student ability or achievement levels on an adaptive basis.

After an independent alignment study is completed for each content area, the contractor must develop or obtain additional items and add them to fill the gaps in alignment. While the major

steps of the proposed compliance agreement outline (see Appendix E) originally pertained to Title I schools and students only, the State wishes to fulfill the compliance agreement while moving forward with requirements of the newly reauthorized ESEA, PL 107-110, to include tests for all students, all schools, grades 3-8 and grade 11 in reading and math. See the initial detailed Proposed Action Plan for grades 4, 8, and 11 in Appendix F. This proposed timeline and workplan is still subject to final approval by the U.S. Department of Education. Necessary steps and dates to accomplish implementation of required tests in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 will be added in like manner at a later date. Except for the external, independent, third-party alignment study to take place in May and June of 2002, Offerors should respond to this request for proposals with cost proposals and responses that address all components and steps in the proposed timeline/workplan, including the detailed steps and dates for the needed tests in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 which will mirror those for 4, 8, and 11 and will be added at a later date. In addition, Offerors should include in their responses the costs necessary to address similar steps which will also be added to the detailed workplan for the science tests at grades 4, 8, and 11. See below for scheduled major target dates for full test administrations:

Timeline for MontCAS Phase 2 test administration:

Grades 4, 8, and 11 (reading and math) – April 2004 (first full administration)

Grades 3, 5, 6, 7 (reading and math) - by April 2006 (first full administration along with subsequent full administration of tests at grades 4, 8, and 11)

Grades 4, 8, and 11 (science) – by April 2008 (first full administration along with the above)

Students To Be Tested

Montana Enrollment (for the 2000 – 2001 school year) for the grades to be tested:

Grade 3:	11,597
Grade 4:	11,682
Grade 5:	12,152
Grade 6:	12,070
Grade 7:	12,431
Grade 8:	12,517
Grade 11:	11,974
TOTAL:	84,423

There are 877 public schools contained in 349 administrative units across the state. There are approximately 12,164 total non-public school K-12 students in the state. American Indian students comprise 10.5% of the total student population. For more information, refer to Facts About Montana Education, Appendix G.

2.1 Technical Quality

2.1.1 The student population in Montana is unique in its ethnic membership. With a Native American population constituting ten percent of the student population, it is important that potential cultural bias issues be addressed. The successful Offeror will identify how potential bias for this population of students was addressed in the development of test questions or provide a detailed plan for addressing potential bias during the first year of this contract.

2.1.2 The Offeror will identify how the development of the proposed instrument adhered to the testing standards as described in the joint AERA/NCME/APA Testing Standards, and provide copies of technical manuals. The Offeror will also identify how the proposed instrument adheres to the technical standards required in the Peer Reviewer Guidance for Evaluating Evidence of Final Assessments Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act from the U.S. Department of Education. (See Appendix D.)

2.2 Products and Services for Which Offers are Requested

The following sections describe the required products and services for criterion-referenced testing at grades 3 through 8 and grade 11 in reading and math and grades 4, 8, and 11 in science. Offerors must ensure that proposed products and services will meet requirements under the statutes listed in Section 2.1. Amounts available for this proposal, contingent upon receipt of federal grant awards for state assessments under Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 107-110) enacted January 8, 2002, will be in the range of \$1.5 Million to \$2.5 Million per year to address completely the steps and the full range of services in the Proposed Action Plan (including specific similar steps not yet shown for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in reading and math and grades 4, 8, and 11 in science) contained in Appendix F.

Refer to Section 2.0 for enrollment at each grade level to be tested and to approximate number of possible non-public participants.

Offeror will provide a 1-2 page executive summary of a proposal that will assist the State to adhere to required guidance and statutes and meet the needs as outlined in this request for proposals.

2.2.1 Match to Content Standards

The State is desirous of selecting a criterion-referenced instrument that measures, as much as possible, the Montana content standards in reading, mathematics, and science included as Appendix H. Appendix B outlines the format for matching test items from the proposed instrument with the Montana content standards and benchmarks. The instrument should reflect the core skills as well as the higher order thinking skills included in the content standards. The State will consider tests that include both multiple choice and short answer items as well as performance measures, as long as the addition of short answer or performance items does not cause the proposed cost to exceed the maximum for the range of funds expressed in Sections 4.0 and 2.2.

2.2.2 Administration and Management Materials

A special cover will be required for the test booklets identifying them as part of the state program. Answer sheets for paper and pencil tests will be required to be customized to align to the tests and to Montana's requirements for coding. The contractor will also provide appropriate introductory, orientation, and administration materials, along with corresponding technical manuals. In addition, district-level and school-level management guides will be required that outline the district-level and school-level responsibilities and requirements for organizing and managing the local test administration.

Customized materials will be required to identify tests as part of the State program. The State also requires materials on which, as part of the contract price and at no extra cost, the contractor will accommodate, as requested, state-level and district-level "pre-slugging" of selected school and student information, such as district and school codes, student name, identification number, gender, ethnicity, special program status (Title I, students with

disabilities, Vocational Education), and other identified and federally required disaggregation categories, such as socioeconomic status, migrant status, and limited English proficiency status.

Offerors also are advised that the State wishes to adopt a test that is as efficient as possible--that is, a test that maximizes information provided while minimizing the complexity involved in testing, for both staff and students.

2.2.3 Interpretation Materials

In addition to production of required reporting as outlined in the Proposed Action Plan (Appendix F), the contractor shall provide interpretation materials to assist the OPI, districts, and schools with appropriate reporting and use of their results. These materials should provide suggestions for identifying students' strengths and deficiencies, reviewing instruction, and reporting both individual and group results to parents, school boards, and the public.

2.2.4 Scoring and Reporting

The contractor shall scan and score all tests (or provide this function online) and create data files and hard-copy reports in consultation with district and state personnel. The Offeror must identify methods to assure proper and required disaggregations of the data for evaluation. Districts must receive under the contract price both the hard-copy reports and the data files and readily useable software to assist with analysis of results and generation of reports. The State would receive both data files and summary reports. Offerors must describe with specificity the software application(s) that will be provided to the State and districts for the data to be readily useable. Offerors must describe how they will work with the State to produce reports required by federal statute and Board of Public Education rule.

2.2.5 Montana Special Reporting Requirements

With many small and rural schools, reporting on the performance of small samples will be a special challenge in Montana. Offerors are requested to propose aggregation, disaggregation, and reporting methods that facilitate public reporting but guard the confidentiality of individual students. Methods that provide aggregate reports by region, consortia or cooperative structure, or demographic characteristics so that no fewer than six students are included in a report are encouraged.

2.2.6 Timeline for Receipt of Test Results

Offerors must describe the timeline for when scores can be expected after first full administration and standard setting and the timeline for receipt of scores in subsequent years.

2.3 Use of Test Results for Phase 2 of the Assessment System and Improving Instruction

The State wishes Phase 2 of the Montana Comprehensive Assessment System (MontCAS Phase 2) to provide information to assist all schools in assessing their progress in the goal of all students becoming proficient in reading, math, and science and to provide results that are as useful as possible for teachers, administrators, and curriculum planners.

2.3.1 Technical Assistance

Offerors must describe how they would design and assist with the delivery of technical assistance with accompanying materials on how test results can properly be used to improve instruction. The audience for this training will be OPI and other education leaders in the State. The Offeror will describe in the technical assistance plans how to build statewide leadership capacity for technical assistance. Offerors should briefly describe the content to be addressed in this training. The dates for the training will be determined during the contract negotiations. Costs for this training, if any, must be included in the Cost Proposal. In addition, Offerors must describe availability and level of training for school district test coordinators in the administration of the tests (how many trainings, depth of content to be covered).

2.3.2 State-Level Data Management

The State of Montana is ready to take the next steps in building a coordinated comprehensive statewide assessment system. To assist in the development of this resource, the State requests a proposal as part of the contract price, at no extra cost, for the training and technical assistance necessary to manage this system, to provide training and technical assistance to state level staff, public relations assistance as this system is implemented, and the materials necessary for success.

2.3.3 Public Relations

The Offeror must describe public relations methods and materials that will help prepare state staff, teachers, administrators, and the public for this new testing program.

2.4 Test Accommodations

The State is interested in including all (100%) of the students who are enrolled in accredited schools, both public and non-public, and other non-public schools that must be included in the grades tested. The State also wishes to consider any other suggestions Offerors might have to increase the likeliness of all students being tested. Offerors should list all accommodations allowable for the tests they are proposing. Accommodations for each subtest should also be described.

2.5 Comparability of Results

The State is interested in obtaining/establishing national norms through statistically sound methods for the tests to be implemented as well as proficiency level scoring, if possible. Offerors should describe the possibilities for establishing and providing norm-referenced scores if feasible, perhaps in the latter years of the contract period. If deemed not feasible, Offerors should indicate so in the response.

2.6 Non-Public School Services

Accredited nonpublic schools in the state of Montana are required to participate in this assessment program. Some non-accredited nonpublic schools and residential treatment centers under contract with the State that receive federal funding must also participate. Offerors are asked to include testing for these nonpublic school students in their cost proposals.

2.7 Distribution and Collection of Materials

The contractor will be responsible for the distribution of all materials sent to school districts and the collection of all materials to be scored after the testing is completed. If online format is proposed, describe the electronic equivalent or methods to be used.

2.8 Technical Support

During the contract period the successful Offeror will need to establish and staff a toll-free number for state and district assessment staff to use for assistance as needed. It is expected that the successful contractor will participate in workshops that will be planned during the contract period as needed as part of the contract price, at no extra cost.

2.9 Alternate Assessment

The Montana Alternate Assessment Scales were implemented in Spring of 2001 and will continue to be in place for Spring of 2002 testing as an alternate to the norm-referenced tests, known as MontCAS Phase 1. (See Appendix I.) The State is interested in assistance with incorporating this same alternate as part of MontCAS Phase 2 and including results in the reporting that make sense for students, parents, and educators. The State is desirous of additional fine-tuning in its approach to alternate assessment to meet all technical standards and reporting requirements and Offerors must address approaches to accomplish and/or accommodate this goal in their proposals. The State may wish to involve additional consulting entities such as the National Center for Educational Outcomes (at the State's cost) with whom the contractor would need to work.

2.10 Additional Item Development

After completion of an independent alignment study of the selected test with the Montana content standards in reading and math at grades 3-8 and grade 11 and in science at grades 4, 8, and 11, additional test items must be developed or obtained by the contractor as part of the contract price to fill the gaps identified. The contractor must field-test and then incorporate the additional items with the initial test. Offerors must address approaches to accomplish this step which is described in the Proposed Action Plan (Appendix F.)

2.11 Proficiency Level/Performance Standard Setting

Proficiency level setting must be accomplished after the first full administration of the grade 4, 8, and 11 reading and math tests and again after the first full administration of the reading and math tests at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 and again after the first full administration of the science tests at grades 4, 8, and 11. Offerors must propose procedures to establish proficiency levels in order to produce performance standards. The successful contractor will be responsible for developing and implementing a process for establishing various cut scores and the particular cut score required for a proficiency determination.

The Offeror should describe the following:

- The methods and procedures they will use to develop proficiency levels for each of the uses described above. Offerors may discuss and identify more than one option that could be considered.
- How the Offeror will direct the work of committees of local educators and other stakeholders who will participate in the benchmarking and standard setting processes.

- How information about the proficiency levels will be disseminated to students, parents, schools, districts and other interested parties and will be reflected in the school and district reports.
- How the proficiency levels will be applied to the first year's results, and how the data can be used.
- The timeline for when scores can be expected after first full administration and standard setting and the timeline for receipt of scores in subsequent years.

SECTION 3

OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS

- 3.0** The State may make such investigations as deemed necessary to determine the ability of the offeror to supply the products and perform the services specified.
- 3.1** The State reserves the right to reject any proposal if the evidence submitted by, or investigation of, the offeror fails to satisfy the State that offeror is properly qualified to carry out the obligations of the contract.
- 3.2** In determining the capabilities of an offeror to perform the services specified herein, the following informational requirements must be met by the offeror and will be weighed by the State. **(Note: Each item must be thoroughly addressed. Taking exception to any requirements listed in this Section may disqualify the proposal.)**
- 3.2.1** Offeror shall provide a minimum of three references that are using services of the type proposed in this RFP. The references should fall within the categories identified below. At a minimum, the offeror shall provide the company name, the location where the services were provided, contact person(s), customer telephone number, a complete description of the service type, and dates the services were provided. The State reserves the right to use any information or additional references deemed necessary to establish the ability of the offerors to perform the conditions of the contract. Negative references may be grounds for proposal disqualification.
- 3.2.1.1** These references should include state government, large school districts, or universities where the offeror, preferably within the last six years, has successfully completed a contract to provide services for a large-scale, statewide, standards-based assessment system.
- 3.2.1.2** These references should include contact information for the person responsible for state-level implementation of the program.
- 3.2.2** Offerors shall provide a description of their organization – the full name and address of the organization and, if applicable, the branch office, division, or other subordinate unit that will directly perform the proposed work. Include the name and title of the chief administrator of the unit, and descriptions of the experience of all personnel who will have direct and significant responsibilities for the project, plainly identifying the person who has overall responsibility for project management.
- 3.2.3** Offerors shall specify how long the company submitting the proposal has been in business of developing and supporting state assessment programs.

SECTION 4

COST PROPOSAL

4.0 Estimated Budget

The acceptable range for awards is \$1.5 million to \$2.5 million per year for five years. Yearly renewals each year thereafter (for no more than seven years total) may include reasonable negotiated rate increases as described in Sec. 1.13.5, contingent upon funding available. Offerors must submit a cost proposal broken out by year for the five year two month contract period.

SECTION 5

EVALUATION CRITERIA

5.0 Evaluation Procedure

- 5.0.1** The evaluation committee will separate proposals into “responsive” and “non-responsive” proposals. Non-responsive proposals will be eliminated from further consideration.
- 5.0.2** Any proposal that fails to achieve a passing score for any part/section for which a passing score is indicated will be disqualified from further consideration.
- 5.0.3** The evaluation committee will evaluate the remaining proposals and determine whether to award the contract to the best proposal or to seek discussion/negotiation or a best and final offer before awarding a contract. Selection and award will be based on the offeror’s proposal and other items outlined in this RFP. Responses must be complete and address all the criteria listed. Information or materials presented by offerors outside the formal response or subsequent discussion/negotiation or “best and final offer,” if requested, will not be considered and will have no bearing on any award.
- 5.0.4** The evaluation committee will consist of nine members, and BJ Granbery will chair the committee, however, until contract award is complete, all contact with the evaluation committee is prohibited unless authorized by the sole point of contact, Jeanne Wolf.

5.1 Evaluation Criteria

The total possible score for a proposal is **500 points**. If deemed necessary, the State may request additional information to determine an offeror’s ability to provide the services. The evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria.

Alignment		150 points available	
Category		Section(s) of RFP	Point Value
A. Alignment with Purpose for Testing		1.3.5; App. C	20
- Understanding purpose, tasks, scope			
- Board of Public Education criteria			
B. Alignment with Content Standards		1.3.6; App. B	90
- Reading			
- Mathematics			
C. Additional Item Development		2.10	40

Technical Issues		125 points available	
Category		Sections of RFP	Point Value
A. Sound Technical Quality		2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.0	25
- Test bias			
- Meeting technical standards			
- No “out of level” or “adaptive” levels			

B.	Ability to Provide Meaningful Results	2.2.4, 2.2.6, 2.11, 2.3	25
	- Reporting		
	- Scoring		
	- Standards setting		
	- Timeline for Receipt of Results		
C.	Large Numbers of Students Included in Testing	2.2.5, 2.4, 2.0	15
	- Accommodations		
	- Proposals for broad inclusion of students		
	- Accessibility Issues		
D.	Test Administration and Management	2.2.2, 2.7, 2.6	15
	- Forms management		
	- Support, distribution, and security		
	- Provisions for Non-Public Schools		
E.	Opportunities for Public Involvement	2.3.3	15
	- Reporting and PR plan		
F.	Factors Influencing Interpretation of Results	2.2.3, 2.3	15
	- Materials/Use		
G.	Alternate Assessment	2.9	15

Technical and Professional Development Support		75 points available	
Category		Section(s) of RFP	Point Value
H.	Proposed training – state level staff	2.3.1	15
I.	Proposed training - test administration	2.3.1	15
J.	Proposed standards setting	2.11	25
K.	Proposed dissemination/use of results	2.3, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.6	15
L.	Toll free number for assistance	2.8	5

Offeror Qualifications and Management		50 points available	
Category		Section(s) of RFP	Point Value
M.	Successful experience with other large-scale assessment systems	3.2.1	20
N.	Qualifications of personnel	3.2.2	15
O.	State data management plan	2.3.2	15

Cost Analysis		100 points available	
Category		Section(s) of RFP	Point Value
P.	Resource Demand	2.0, 2.1, 2.2, 4.0	100
	- Products and Full Service Contract at reasonable cost		

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE CONTRACT

1. Parties
2. Effective Date, Duration and Renewal
3. Price Adjustments
4. Services and/or Supplies
5. Consideration/Payment
6. Access and Retention of Records
7. Assignment, Transfer and Subcontracting
8. Hold Harmless/Indemnification
9. Contract Performance Security
10. Insurance
11. Compliance with Workers' Compensation Act
12. Intellectual Property
13. Compliance with Laws
14. Contract Termination
15. Liaison and Service of Notices
16. Meetings
17. Choice of Law and Venue
18. Scope, Amendment and Interpretation
19. Execution

(INSERT PROJECT TITLE)

(insert date), 200()

1. PARTIES

THIS CONTRACT, is entered into by and between the State of Montana **(insert agency name)**, (hereinafter referred to as “the State”), whose address and phone number are **(insert address)**, **(insert phone number)** and **(insert name of contractor)**, (hereinafter referred to as the “Contractor”), whose nine digit Federal ID Number, address and phone number are **(insert federal id number)**, **(insert address)** and **(insert phone number)**.

THE PARTIES AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

2. EFFECTIVE DATE, DURATION, AND RENEWAL

(a) This contract **(insert contract number)** shall take effect on **(insert date)**, 200(). The contract shall terminate on **(insert date)**, 200(), unless terminated earlier in accordance with the terms of this contract. (Mont. Code Ann. § 18-4-313.)

(b) This contract may, upon mutual agreement between the parties and according to the terms of the existing contract, be extended in **(insert number)**-year intervals, or any interval that is advantageous to the State, for a period not to exceed **(insert number)** additional years. This extension is dependent upon legislative appropriations and in no case may this contract run longer than a **(insert number)**-year period. (State contracts generally may not exceed a total of seven years.)

3. PRICE ADJUSTMENTS

Contractor and the State agree price adjustments may be made at the time of contract renewal through a process of negotiation with the Contractor and the State. Any price increases must be based on demonstrated industry-wide or regional increases in the Contractor's costs. Publications such as the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers may be used to determine the increased value.

4. SERVICES AND/OR SUPPLIES

Contractor agrees to provide to the State the following **(insert supplies, services, etc.)**.

5. CONSIDERATION/PAYMENT

(a) In consideration for the **(insert supplies or services)** to be provided, the State shall pay according to the following schedule: **(insert pay schedule)**.

(b) The State may withhold payments to the Contractor if the Contractor has not performed in accordance with this contract. Such withholding cannot be greater than the additional costs to the State caused by the lack of performance.

6. ACCESS AND RETENTION OF RECORDS

(a) The Contractor agrees to provide the State, Legislative Auditor or their authorized agents access to any records necessary to determine contract compliance. (Mont. Code Ann. § 18-1-118.)

(b) The Contractor agrees to create and retain records supporting the **(insert services rendered or supplies provided)** for a period of three years after either the completion date of this contract or the conclusion of any claim, litigation or exception relating to this contract taken by the State of Montana or a third party.

7. ASSIGNMENT, TRANSFER AND SUBCONTRACTING

The Contractor shall not assign, transfer or subcontract any portion of this contract without the express written consent of the State. (Mont. Code Ann. § 18-4-141.)

8. HOLD HARMLESS/INDEMNIFICATION

The Contractor agrees to protect, defend, and save the State, its elected and appointed officials, agents, and employees, while acting within the scope of their duties as such, harmless from and against all claims, demands, causes of action of any kind or character, including the cost of defense thereof, arising in favor of the Contractor's employees or third parties on account of bodily or personal injuries, death, or damage to property arising out of services performed or omissions of services or in any way resulting from the acts or omissions of the Contractor and/or its agents, employees, representatives, assigns, subcontractors, except the sole negligence of the State, under this agreement.

9. CONTRACT PERFORMANCE SECURITY

Contract performance security in the form of **(insert form of security)** in the amount of **(insert dollar amount)** has been received by the State Procurement Bureau, P.O. Box 200135, Helena, MT 59620-0135, and will be returned to the Contractor after successful completion of the contract. This security must remain in effect for the entire contract period.

10. INSURANCE

General Requirements: The Contractor shall maintain for the duration of the contract, at its cost and expense, insurance against claims for injuries to persons or damages to property, including contractual liability, which may arise from or in connection with the performance of the work by the Contractor, agents, employees, representatives, assigns, or subcontractors. This insurance shall cover such claims as may be caused by any negligent act or omission.

Primary Insurance: The Contractor's insurance coverage shall be primary insurance as respect to the State, its officers, officials, employees, and volunteers and shall apply separately to each project or location. Any insurance or self-insurance maintained by the State, its officers, officials, employees or volunteers shall be excess of the Contractor's insurance and shall not contribute with it.

Specific Requirements for Commercial General Liability: The Contractor shall purchase and maintain occurrence coverage with combined single limits for bodily injury, personal injury, and property

damage of \$500,000 per occurrence and \$1,000,000 aggregate per year to cover such claims as may be caused by any act, omission, or negligence of the Contractor or its officers, agents, representatives, assigns or subcontractors.

Additional Insured Status: The State, its officers, officials, employees, and volunteers are to be covered as additional insureds; for liability arising out of activities performed by or on behalf of the Contractor, including the insured's general supervision of the Contractor; products and completed operations; premises owned, leased, occupied, or used.

Deductibles and Self-Insured Retentions: Any deductible or self-insured retention must be declared to and approved by the state agency. At the request of the agency either: (1) the insurer shall reduce or eliminate such deductibles or self-insured retentions as respects the State, its officers, officials, employees, or volunteers; or (2) the Contractor shall procure a bond guaranteeing payment of losses and related investigations, claims administration, and defense expenses.

Certificate of Insurance/Endorsements: A certificate of insurance from an insurer with a Best's rating of no less than A- indicating compliance with the required coverages, has been received by the State Procurement Bureau, P.O. Box 200135, Helena, MT 59620-0135. The Contractor must notify the State immediately, of any material change in insurance coverage, such as changes in limits, coverages, change in status of policy, etc. The State reserves the right to require complete copies of insurance policies at all times.

11. COMPLIANCE WITH WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Contractors are required to comply with the provisions of the Montana Workers' Compensation Act while performing work for the State of Montana in accordance with sections 39-71-120, 39-71-401, and 39-71-405, MCA. Proof of compliance must be in the form of workers' compensation insurance, an independent contractor exemption, or documentation of corporate officer status. Neither the contractor nor its employees are employees of the State. This insurance/exemption must be valid for the entire contract period. A renewal document must be sent to the State Procurement Bureau, P.O. Box 200135, Helena, MT 59620-0135, upon expiration.

12. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

(a) All patent and other legal rights in or to inventions arising out of activities funded in whole or in part by this contract must be available to the State for royalty-free and nonexclusive licensing. The Contractor shall notify the State in writing of any invention conceived or reduced to practice in the course of performance of this contract.

(b) The State shall have a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable right to reproduce, publish or otherwise use and authorize others to use, copyrightable property created under this contract.

13. COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS

The Contractor must, in performance of work under this contract, fully comply with all applicable federal, state, or local laws, rules and regulations, including the Montana Human Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Any subletting or subcontracting by the Contractor subjects

subcontractors to the same provision. In accordance with section 49-3-207, MCA, the Contractor agrees that the hiring of persons to perform the contract will be made on the basis of merit and qualifications and there will be no discrimination based upon race, color, religion, creed, political ideas, sex, age, marital status, physical or mental disability, or national origin by the persons performing the contract.

14. CONTRACT TERMINATION

(a) The State may, by written notice to the Contractor, terminate this contract in whole or in part at any time the Contractor fails to perform this contract.

(b) Either party may, by written notice, terminate this contract in whole or in part with 30-days notice.

(c) The State, at its sole discretion, may terminate or reduce the scope of this contract if available funding is reduced for any reason. (See Mont. Code Ann. § 18-4-313(3).)

15. LIAISON AND SERVICE OF NOTICES

All project management and coordination on behalf of the State shall be through a single point of contact designated as the State's liaison. Contractor shall designate a liaison who will provide the single point of contact for management and coordination of Contractor's work. All work performed pursuant to this contract shall be coordinated between the State's liaison and the Contractor's liaison.

_____ will be the liaison for the State.

_____ (Address)
_____ (City, State, ZIP)
_____ (Telephone #)
_____ (Fax #)

_____ will be the liaison for the Contractor.

_____ (Address)
_____ (City, State, ZIP)
_____ (Telephone #)
_____ (Fax #)

The State's liaison and Contractor's liaison may be changed by written notice to the other party. Written notices, requests, or complaints will first be directed to the liaison.

16. MEETINGS

The Contractor is required to meet with the State's personnel, or designated representatives, to resolve technical or contractual problems that may occur during the term of the contract, at no additional cost to the State. Meetings will occur as problems arise and will be coordinated by the State. The Contractor will be given a minimum of three full working days notice of meeting date, time, and location. Face-to-face meetings are desired. However, at the Contractor's option and expense, a conference call meeting may be substituted. Consistent failure to participate in problem resolution meetings two consecutive missed or rescheduled meetings, or to make a good faith effort to resolve problems, may result in termination of the contract.

17. CHOICE OF LAW AND VENUE

This contract is governed by the laws of Montana. The parties agree that any litigation concerning this bid, proposal or subsequent contract must be brought in the First Judicial District in and for the County of Lewis and Clark, State of Montana and each party shall pay its own costs and attorney fees. (See Mont. Code Ann. § 18-1-401.)

18. SCOPE, AMENDMENT AND INTERPRETATION

(a) This contract consists of **(insert number)** numbered pages, any Attachments as required, **RFP #02-369J** as amended and the Contractor's response as amended. In the case of dispute or ambiguity about the minimum levels of performance by the Contractor the order of precedence of document interpretation is in the same order.

(b) These documents contain the entire agreement of the parties. Any enlargement, alteration or modification requires a written amendment signed by both parties.

19. EXECUTION

The parties through their authorized agents have executed this contract on the dates set out below.

STATE OF MONTANA, OFFICE OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

CONTRACTOR'S NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, STATE, ZIP
FEDERAL ID #

BY: _____
(Name/Title)

BY: _____
(Name/Title)

BY: _____
(Signature)

BY: _____
(Signature)

DATE: _____

DATE: _____

Approved as to legal content:

Legal Counsel (Date)
Department of _____

Approved as to form:

Contracts Officer (Date)
State Procurement Bureau

APPENDIX B

Format for Item Match to Montana Content Standards

With the goal of a comprehensive system, and alignment of standards, instruction, and assessment in mind, please match each item on the selected test instrument in five subject areas with the Montana Content Standards and benchmarks, contained in Appendix C: Reading, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Communication Arts: Writing, Literature, Media Literacy, and Speaking and Listening. The Communication Arts standards present more complex curriculum and assessment issues. Please provide the most feasible item match to those areas using the proposed instrument. It is conceivable that some items will match across subject areas (Math in the Science subtest, Literature in the Reading subtest).

Please use the format described below in presenting the match information for each grade and subject area to be tested.

Format for match of Test Items to Content Standards:

**Reading, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and
Communication Arts: Writing, Literature, Media Literacy, and Speaking and
Listening.**

Mapping of the Montana Content Standards and Benchmarks to the Test Items

The Montana Content Standards and benchmarks are included in Appendix C. Each content standard is in boldface type and is comprised of a general statement and identified by a number (e.g., 1 or 4) followed by benchmarks identified by "End of Grade" and numbered within each grade level designation. The mapping of the test to the Content Standards will be done at the component level.

Each Content Standards and the numeric headings for each benchmark appear in Appendix B. For example, 1.1 in Reading refers to the first Content Standards in reading "Students construct meaning as they comprehend, interpret, and respond to what they read" and the benchmark "make predictions and connections between new material and previous information/experiences."

In each cell, please place the item number from the test being mapped and the page number where the item can be found. Extend the tables below and use as many pages as necessary. Only one item with page number should appear in each cell.

One separate item/benchmark must be completed for each grade and subject area. While it is most desirable that each test item should appear in this analysis only once, it is possible that an item can reference more than one benchmark. If an item does reference more than one benchmark, please indicate which benchmark is considered the primary match by placing a "P" next to the primary match and an "S" next to all secondary matches. The total number of items that assess each benchmark should appear in the last cell in each column.

Example

Reading

Grade 4

Form Z, Level 67

SUBTEST	ITEM, PAGE	BENCHMARK MATCH
Vocabulary	1, p 7	1.1 (P), 1.2 (S), 1.3 (S)
	2, p 7	1.1
	3, p 8	1.1
	4, p 8	1.2
	5, p 8	1.3
Reading Comprehension	1, p 10	2.1
	2, p 11	2.2
	3, p 11	2.2
	4, p 11	2.2
	5, p 11	2.3
	6, p 12	2.2
	7, p 13	2.3
	8, p 13	

APPENDIX C

MONTANA

Board of Public Education Statement of Purpose for Student Assessment

The primary purpose of assessment is to serve learning. Classroom assessment is the primary means through which assessment impacts instruction and learning for individuals. State-level and large-scale assessment affect learning through assisting policy decisions and assuring program quality for all students.

The Board of Public Education sets forth the following criteria to guide review of test instruments to provide information concerning the academic achievement of Montana students:

1. Alignment with a Stated Purpose for Testing
2. Acceptable Alignment with Stated Subject Area Standards and Expectations
3. Sound Technical Quality
4. Ability to Provide Meaningful Results
5. Large Numbers of Students can be Included in Testing
6. Acceptable Level of Test Administration and Management
7. Associated Resource Demand - Financial, Human, Instructional
8. Requirements to Change from Current Testing to a New System
9. Potential Unintended Consequences
10. Opportunity for Public Input
11. Additional Factors Influencing Interpretation of Test Results

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE QUALITY OF TEST INSTRUMENTS WITHIN AN ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

The Board of Public Education sets forth the following criteria to guide review of test instruments to provide information concerning the academic achievement of Montana students:

1. Alignment with a Stated Purpose for Testing

A clear statement of the purpose for assessment is critical to guide the Board's review of the test instrument. That purpose should include both overall purposes for a comprehensive system of assessment as well as the specific purpose for which this test is to be used.

Task Force Discussion: The degree that the test meets the purpose will be determined by examining the types of information that can be obtained from this test, and matching it to the Board's stated purpose for testing. The purposes for which state level testing can effectively be used may vary widely from the purposes for which testing may be used at a classroom level.

2. Acceptable Alignment with Stated Subject Area Standards and Expectations

The test items and types of questions should correspond, at an acceptable level, to the established content standards for the subject areas at the chosen grade levels. The gaps that exist between the items on the test instrument and the standards might be addressed with additional components or modules that could efficiently supplement the instrument at either the state or local levels.

Task Force discussion: Adopted content and performance standards can be matched to test items, using information that describes the tests objectives and skills, examining the test items themselves, and determining the degree to which each standard is measured. An acceptable level of match will be set by the Board, based on the intended use of test results and the degree of impact that may result. The greater the impact of the results of this test, the higher the correlation should be between the standards and the test items. The level of match may determine whether additional items or tests, at the state or local level, could be used to provide assessment of those standards not well assessed by the reviewed instrument.

In addition to content match, the process must also examine the balance between broad coverage (breadth) of an area of knowledge and deeper coverage (depth) of a small component of that knowledge. Items that provide diversity to align with standards that involve cognitive complexity or performance (such as writing, lab experiments, or requiring open ended responses) . may provide important components for matching but require more costly testing procedures.

3. Sound Technical Quality

Test results that will be aggregated and reported at the state level should meet high levels of reliability (providing similar results time after time), validity (measuring what is intended to be measured), and equity (demonstrated lack of bias toward gender differences, racial groups, disabled students, and other specific categories of students).

Task Force discussion: Each reviewed test instrument should be accompanied by technical information. The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (APA Standards) is the most widely accepted set of criteria for evaluating the technical quality of tests. Levels needed for acceptance will be determined by the board, based on the intended impact and use of the test results. The greater the impact, the greater the need for high technical quality.

4. Ability to Provide Meaningful Results

The results that can be gathered from this test should be timely, understandable, and meaningful to the audiences for whom the results are intended. The method of scoring the test results, and the reporting format should correlate with the purpose for which the testing was intended.

Task Force discussion: The Board will need to determine if the results can be reported in a timely fashion in a desired format -- scale scores (stanines, percentiles), or whatever seems the most appropriate. The Montana State Education Profile that is currently being developed might include pertinent information to supplement the test results and assist in providing meaningful assessment information. An important consideration will be the ability to separate the results into informative categories of gender, race, socioeconomic status, and program services, to meet the requirements of special education, Title I, and other programs for reporting program results.

5. Large Numbers of Students can be Included in Testing

The standards and educational expectations for high achievement are for all students. Unless a team has determined that a student cannot benefit from a test or that the tests would be invalid if taken, all students should be included in the testing. The test should include a degree of flexibility that will allow accommodations similar to those needed in the instructional setting, without damaging the validity of the test. Special education and several other programs require that alternative tests must be developed for children who cannot be tested with the state test instrument to determine if those children, and all children, are progressing toward their goals. The more students excluded from regular testing, the more costly the alternatives will become.

Task Force discussion: Students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and others students may be in circumstances that limit their ability to take a test in exactly the same fashion as other students. Some children have instructional needs that are met by the classroom teachers (a student with injured hands who can't write without assistance, a student who can't hear the spoken instructions, a medically fragile child who needs to work in short sessions), but would not be able participate in the testing unless some accommodations to the instructions were allowed. With slight adjustments that will not invalidate the results, these children can also be tested with a regular test. Without acceptable accommodations, many children with disabilities and other students who cannot participate in the testing will be excluded or placed in testing situations that actually create a biased situation for them.

6. Acceptable Level of Test Administration and Management

The purpose for the tests and the intended impact will influence the level of test administration, management, and use of results. Meaningful results require thoughtful management and training of staff. However, increased levels of management will increase costs, complexity, and staffing needs.

Task Force discussion: *Comparable test results require uniform administration of the test. The decisions about administration - what grades are tested, all students or a sampling, voluntary or mandatory testing - will impact the amount of management needed at the state and local level. Those decisions may drive a need for secure locations for the tests, a variety of testing forms, state level purchasing and distributing, scoring service responsibilities, return of tests booklets to a central repository, and additional data gathering and reporting. The more complex the management needs, the more costly and confusing the process may become.*

Are the grade levels to be tested appropriate to meet the purpose for this testing? Does testing overload occur at particular grade levels? Can some assessment be done at other levels? Why are some grade levels chosen? Are some test results more meaningful at the local level and others at the state level.

7. Associated Resource Demand - Financial, Human, Instructional

The costs of using this test and the benefits from its use must be evaluated, and the benefits should be weighed against the costs involved. A comparison to another test, and to current costs should be done to determine if similar results could be obtained in a manner that would reduce costs, lost instructional time, and labor. If additional resources are required, the source for those resources should be identified.

Task Force discussion: *Consideration must be given to the costs required for development, adoption, purchase, scoring, training, administering, reporting, and whatever other activities will be necessary, as well as the time, planning, and implementing the activities. Current and future methods of funding the costs must also be considered. Centralized purchasing and scoring may offset costs of buying in small batches. Placing testing responsibilities at the level (state or local) at which the testing data is most useful may provide for efficiencies.*

8. Requirements to Change from Current Testing to a New System

Examination of the current ability of the educational system to respond to adopting the assessment is critical to the successful use of the results, and will drive the timeline for implementation. Schools, classrooms, and teachers may need curricular changes and professional development opportunities. Policy boards, data collection practices and financial practices may need major changes.

Task Force discussion: *A multitude of practical questions will need to be considered by the Board before changes in testing are implemented, and before timelines are established. How long will it take to change from current testing to a new system? What changes and training will be necessary? Does this test have specific transition issues? Will districts have an opportunity to revise programs and curriculum prior to the imposition of this test? Will incentives for use be necessary? What level of professional development will be required to prepare teachers and classrooms to provide instruction that prepares students to be able to demonstrate proficiency on this test?*

9. Potential Unintended Consequences

While focusing on intended results, unintended consequences may be overlooked. Negative impacts may result from difficult administration, simplistic reporting, or a variety of other factors. Careful attention to possible unintended consequences while test decisions are being made may help avoid

some of the unintended results.

Task Force discussion: *A major unintended consequence of many testing programs is the lack of understanding of results, and the resulting use for purposes opposite those that were intended, such as simplistic comparisons, high stakes decisions that are educationally inappropriate, narrowed school curriculum to encompass only what's tested, or non-testing of students who lower the test results.*

10. Opportunity for Public Input

The opinions of the public, educators, parents, and other interested parties should be included as part of the evaluation of the test instrument. Successful implementation of a test instrument may require planning activities to respond to concerns and expectations, provide information, or clarify misunderstandings about the nature of the test instrument, its purpose and intended use.

Task Force discussion: *Lack of understanding or acceptance of the use of the test by a large portion of the intended audience will seriously limit the use of the results of testing. In some instances, the expectations of the audience for the results may greatly exceed the benefits that can be realized. The degree to which informational activities may need to take place may influence the adoption or implementation timeline.*

11. Additional Factors Influencing Interpretation of Test Results

Additional information, beyond that which can be provided by the test itself, should be identified to provide a context within which the test results can be meaningfully reported. School dropout rates, mobility and poverty levels, trend data, administration factors, number of students tested vs. number enrolled, and district size are some of the additional factors that may need to be identified at the time an instrument is selected, to assure a broader foundation on which to base conclusions that may be drawn from the test results.

Task Force discussion: *___ This criteria was considered as critical by the task force. The test scores and demographics of the students should not be reported in isolation from the other factors that will assist in the provision of meaningful results. And those other factors should be identified when test selection decisions are made. The Montana State Education Profile may provide the vehicle for assuring that, in addition to test results, the context data are available.*

APPENDIX D

(Will insert PDF file which contains "Peer Reviewer Guidance")

APPENDIX E

Executive Summary for the Montana Board of Public Education

January 2002

Presentation: Title I Compliance Hearing and Pending Agreement

Presenter: BJ Granbery, Administrator and Title I Director

Educational Opportunity and Equity Division

Office of Public Instruction

Overview: At a public hearing at 1:00 pm, December 10, 2001, Room 172, at the Capitol, the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) testified on and submitted to the U.S. Department of Education a Proposed Action Plan for Title I Compliance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The plan is still under development and must be approved through the U.S. Department of Education's peer review process now that the public hearing has been completed. The testimony pointed out the lack of resources that has prevented OPI from complying with the federal statute and set forth the major steps in a plan to come into compliance within three years. OPI is negotiating the compliance agreement and participated in the required hearing in order to maintain our current status and protect the status of Title I funding to Montana. OPI fully intends to be in compliance within the three-year action plan timeline, **which is still under development.** The plan is currently for Title I schools only because the only funds OPI has to work with at present are state-level Title I administrative funds which cannot be used to provide an assessment for all students. In light of recent final appropriations for the newly reauthorized ESEA, OPI will work with the U.S. Department of Education to blend plans for compliance with the 1994 law with plans to comply with the new ESEA. Montana is slated to receive over \$3 million per year for development of assessments in reading and math for all students, in all schools, in grades 3-8.

Although subject to further change and approval, the plan for compliance under Title I of the 1994 law consists of these major steps at this time:

- Select a criterion-referenced off-the-shelf test (CRT) by April 2002 (by examining tests from other states as well as issuing an RFP by end of January 2002)
- Give the Iowa Tests (NRT) as scheduled in March 2002
- Conduct an alignment study on both NRT and CRT May and June 2002
- Produce report of alignment study July and August 2002
- Develop or obtain items to fill gaps by December 2002
- Conduct new item try outs January and February 2003
- Pilot new items and new CRT April 2003
- Conduct first full administration of new CRT with new items April 2004
- Set performance standards Summer 2004
- Finish design and dissemination of all required reports Fall 2004

Requested Decision: None

Outlying Issues: The Board may wish, in the future, to align its assessment rule (10.56.101) with the federal requirements in the ESEA Title I compliance agreement and the newly reauthorized ESEA.

Recommendation: It is hoped that OPI can work with the U.S. Department of Education to finalize a compliance agreement that incorporates the work toward the new assessment requirements under ESEA as mentioned above so that valuable and limited resources are used wisely and efforts are not duplicative.

APPENDIX F

Proposed Action Plan for Montana Title I Compliance With the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1994 January 15, 2002

New Note: In light of recent final appropriations for the newly reauthorized ESEA, OPI will work with the U.S. Department of Education to blend plans for compliance with the 1994 law, P.L. 103-382, with plans to comply with the new ESEA, P.L. 107-110, enacted January 8, 2002. Montana is slated to receive over \$3 million per year for development of assessments in reading and math for all students, in all schools, in grades 3-8 plus science at three grade spans. Therefore, OPI wishes to obtain a criterion-referenced test (CRT) through the steps outlined in this plan for all students in grades 4, 8 and 11 in reading and math (instead of just Title I students as explained in the “original” explanatory note) with full administration in April 2004 as planned. The original timeline and workplan will be followed exactly with the expansion to additional grade levels in later years and eventually one additional subject as described in the next paragraph.

Funds outlined on pages one and two of this plan would be used initially and as necessary with new federal funds for state assessments that become available in July 2002, and the future years through the reauthorization period to also obtain reading and math tests for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 as well as science tests for one grade in each of three grade spans. Therefore, the Request for Proposals and Request to other States will address CRT’s in reading and math for grades 3-8 and grade 11 (with 3, 5, 6, and 7 in reading and math implemented in 2006) and in science at grades 4, 8, and 11 (to be implemented in 2008). We will discuss this with Assistant Secretary Susan Neuman and U.S. Department of Education staff on a January 31, 2002 telephone call.

“Original” Explanatory Note: Since the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) is unable to develop the complete Montana Comprehensive Assessment System (MontCAS) as originally planned due to the absence of state funding from the Legislature, the following pertains to a system for Title I schools only, funded with state-level Title I administrative funds and funds remaining from the one-time Title II federal appropriation for such purposes. The funding available is as follows:

Year 1 (2001-2002): up to \$325,000

Title II special one-time appropriation remaining after Phase 1 norm-referenced component second year costs are paid (\$105,000)

Title I administrative set-aside carryover (\$100,000)

Title I administrative set-aside current year funds (\$95,000)

Federal Special Education funds (\$25,000)

Year 2 (2002-2003): up to \$150,000

Title I administrative set-aside carryover and current year funds (\$125,000)

Federal Special Education funds (\$25,000)

Year 3 (2003-2004): up to \$150,000

Title I administrative set-aside carryover and current year funds (\$125,000)

Federal Special Education funds (\$25,000)

TOTAL AVAILABLE NOT TO EXCEED \$625,00 OVER THE THREE YEAR PERIOD.

The funds listed above will cover the assessment costs for Title I students only in grades 4, 8, and 11 in targeted assistance programs and all students in grades 4, 8, and 11 in schoolwide programs. This totals approximately 8,000 students.

Also, in reading this document, please remember the Revised Phases of MontCAS (The Montana Comprehensive Assessment System)

Phase 1: Norm-Referenced Achievement Test (NRT) in all core subjects for all students
(The Iowa Tests are administered each March in grades 4, 8, and 11; funded with state general fund appropriation for March 2001; funded with a portion of the special one-time federal Title II appropriation for standards and assessment for March 2002; funding for March 2003 to be determined.)

Phase 2: Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT) in reading and math for Title I schools
only provided by OPI, augmented with additional performance measures to complete alignment to Montana content standards in reading and math
(Funded with the monies outlined on page one of this document for students served by Title I in grades 4, 8, and 11 in targeted assistance programs and all students in those grades in schoolwide programs)

For All Phases: The Montana Alternate Assessment Scales are used for all students unable to participate in the regular assessment component. The Alternate Assessment consists of teacher ratings of student performance on the Montana Performance Descriptors.

Topic 1.0: Develop State Assessment System consistent with Title I requirements for Title I schools.

Current Status: USED has determined that Montana's assessment system, as planned and submitted, fails to meet many of the requirements of Title I. Phase 1 of the assessment system currently used to monitor school progress as required by Title I is not standards-based and provides only norm-referenced data.

Goal 1.0 To ensure the implementation of a system of assessment(s) designed to measure student progress toward attainment of the State performance standards, including assessments that yield results in at least reading and mathematics administered annually to students in at least one grade in each of three grade ranges—grades 3 through 5, grades 6 through 9, and grades 10 through 12.

The assessment system must provide for--

- participation in the assessments of all students in the grades being assessed;

- reasonable adaptations and appropriate accommodations for students with diverse learning needs, where such adaptations or accommodations are necessary to measure the achievement of those students relative to State standards; and
- inclusion of LEP students, who shall be assessed, to the extent practicable, in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what they know and can do to determine their mastery of skills in subjects other than English. To meet this requirement, States shall make every effort to use or develop linguistically accessible assessment measures, and they may request assistance from the Secretary if those measures are needed.

The assessment system must involve multiple approaches with up-to-date measures of student performance, including measures that assess complex thinking skills and understanding of challenging content.

Assessments must be used for purposes for which they are valid and reliable, and they must meet relevant, nationally recognized, professional and technical standards for quality.

Key to symbols used in charts:
+ On time
- Not on time
Done
*All costs to be adjusted upward as necessary to include all students grades 4, 8 and 11.

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.0	*Cost/ Status	Date	Evidence	Person(s)
Develop a comprehensive assessment design that addresses all characteristics required by Title I. Design will specify purpose(s) of assessment(s), content areas and grade levels to be tested, multiple measures, measurement of higher order thinking skills, alignment to content and performance standards, and expectations of technical quality to be expected of all measures.	+	See below	See below	
Consider tests from other states and concurrently issue an RFP to secure either an off-the-shelf, paper and pencil, criterion-referenced test (CRT) or an already developed on-line, internet-based CRT with documented technical quality and maximum possible alignment to Montana content standards in reading and math, providing for administration, scoring and reporting. Follow all required steps in the Montana Department of Administration (D of A) process for fairly evaluating both RFP responses and offers from other states.	# # +	other states contacted by 01/14/02; RFP materials to D of A by 1/15/02; RFP released by D of A by January 31, 2002	email to state assessment directors; email copy to USED Completed RFP forms submitted to D of A; RFP posted on state's website; copy sent to USED	BJ Granbery, Title I Director Sioux Roth, OPI Purchasing Agent and BJ Granbery, Title I Director

Conduct Evaluation/Selection Process for RFP and other states' submissions cost: \$5,000 for travel of committee members.	+	March 15- April 20, 2002	Decision on selection resulting in contract; notify USED by email	BJ Granbery, Title I Director
Negotiate and sign a contract for a CRT for Phase 2 of an assessment system for Title I purposes. (MontCAS Phase 2)	Up to \$275,000 for year 1; up to \$125,000 for year 2; and up to \$125,000 for year 3 +	April 30, 2002	Signed Contract; copy sent to USED	Jeff Weldon, OPI Attorney; BJ Granbery, Title I Director
Plan a process to ensure alignment of content and performance standards with the assessment considering comprehensiveness, emphasis, and depth. OPI has secured a commitment from NWREL to provide partial support in the form of qualified persons to assist with the planning and conducting of the alignment study.	T.A. from NWREL and/or other consultants (\$15,000 total as necessary for all steps below for this Goal except where noted otherwise) +	March and April, 2002	Work plan for alignment study; send to USED	BJ Granbery, Title I Director, Judy Snow, Assessment Director and Consultant(s)
Complete an analysis of the alignment of the assessment with Montana's standards, identifying any gaps or weaknesses in the alignment. (Conduct this process with both CRT and NRT.)	\$5,000 travel for panel. +	May and June, 2002	Written report on activities, dates, places, persons; send to USED	Consultants; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Report on alignment study	+	July and August, 2002	Written report; send to USED	Consultants; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Develop items to fill gaps in alignment	+	By December 2002	Actual Items; submit to USED	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Item try-outs	+	January and February, 2003	Plan for item try-out; execution of plan; usable items; send plan to USED, then completion dates.	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Complete review of test items for bias to ensure that results measure the essence of the standards and does so for students of diverse backgrounds.	+	January and February, 2003	Report of study's conclusions; send report to USED	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Develop procedures for CRT test administration, scoring, data analysis, and reporting to meet high technical standards.	+	March, 2003	Testing Procedures Document; send to USED	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Pilot new CRT including new added items, as necessary.	+	April 2003	Plan for pilot; send plan to USED; execution of plan	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director

Completion of any needed adjustments in the test forms for new items and new test. Conduct needed validity and reliability studies. Conduct an additional alignment study.	+	July through December 2003	Adjustments made; work plan for alignment, validity and reliability; technical manuals including new items to be produced by October 2004. Report sent to USED on all these steps.	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
First full administration of new test with the additional new items.	+	April 2004	Work plan and schedule for testing; send to USED. Execution of plan and tests given as scheduled; report to USED	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Provide technical manuals that contain such information as validity, reliability, fairness/accessibility, and comparability of results.	+	October 2004	The completed manuals; send to USED	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Develop a plan for on-going revision and improvement	+	June - October 2004	The Plan for Revision; send to USED	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Set Performance Standards (see details under Topic 2.0 below)	+	June through August, 2004	Approvable performance standards; send progress report to USED	Contractor, Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Document that all students are included in the assessment system, especially LEP and students with disabilities.	+	Summer 2004	Participation rates; send progress report to USED	Bob Runkel, Special Education Director; Marilyn Pearson, Assistant Special Education Director; Lynn Hinch, Bilingual Specialist
Review and refine as necessary previously developed policies for including students with disabilities in the statewide assessment system. Revise and refine as necessary/reissue Guidance Document, as necessary.	+	April 2002 through November 2003	Guidance Document and Policies; send to USED	Bob Runkel, Special Education Director; Marilyn Pearson, Assistant Special Education Director
Review and refine as necessary previously developed policies for including LEP students in the statewide assessment system. Revise and refine as necessary/reissue Guidance Document.	+	April 2002 through November 2003	Guidance Document and Policies; send to USED	Lynn Hinch, Bilingual Specialist
Develop statewide monitoring procedures to ensure the inclusion of all students.	+	April 2002 through November 2003	Monitoring Documents; send to USED	Bob Runkel, Special Education Director; Marilyn Pearson, Assistant Special Education Director; Lynn

				Hinch, Bilingual Specialist
Complete technical studies and manual for Alternate Assessment Scales.	+\$25,000 for this work and any costs associated with the four steps above.	By August 2004	Technical Manual; send to USED	Bob Runkel, Special Education Director; Marilyn Pearson, Assistant Special Education Director
Submit assessment system to USED for peer review	+	October, 2004	Package shipped to USED proof of receipt required; Copies retained at OPI	Judy Snow, Assessment Director; BJ Granbery, Title I Director

Topic 2.0: Develop State Performance Standards consistent with Title I Requirements

Current Status: Montana has articulated performance levels and performance descriptors (which we have put into state rule as performance standards) but does not have United States Department of Education (USED) approved performance standards aligned with content standards and assessments. The alignment of performance descriptors to content standards needs to be validated and documented, and exemplars of student work must be provided. In addition, cut scores connected to Phase 2 of MontCAS need to be developed in the work outlined below in order to have approvable performance standards.

Goal 1.0: To ensure challenging student performance standards.

Standards must include challenging student performance standards that ---

- are aligned with State’s content standards;
- describe at least two levels of high performance, proficient and advanced, that determine how well children are mastering the material in the State’s content standards; and
- describe a third level of performance, partially proficient, to provide complete information on the progress of lower-performing children toward achieving the proficient and advanced levels of performance.
- Performance standards answer the question, “How good is good enough?” A system of performance standards may include the following components:
 - performance levels—labels for each level of achievement
 - performance descriptors –narrative descriptions of performance at each level
 - exemplars – examples of student work from a representative sample of all students that illustrate the full range of performance at each level
 - cut scores – scores on a variety of assessments that separates the different levels of performance.

Key to symbols used in charts:
+ On time
- Not on time
Done
*All costs to be adjusted upward as necessary to include all students grades 4, 8 and 11.

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.0	*Cost/Status	Date	Evidence	Person(s)
Describe the process to be used for developing performance standards in reading and math; including procedures for setting cut scores.	Included in testing contract for all steps below plus designated costs for district staff time and travel as necessary +	May 2003	Work plan for setting cut scores	Contractor; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
<p>Review performance levels and performance descriptions incorporating student work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Labels for four performance levels have been designated. - Broad-based groups of Montana educators (including experts in special education and LEP) developed performance descriptors for each level to align with each content standard and benchmark for each grade at the same time as they developed content standards and benchmarks. - Processes involved in writing the descriptors included using the NAEP proficiency level descriptions as models and group consensus utilizing professional judgment. - A review of the previously articulated descriptors and levels will be conducted with an external consultant leading Montana educators through the process. The process will validate alignment to content standards with revisions as necessary and incorporate student work as exemplars. 	<p># #</p> <p>#</p> <p>Consulting Services of Testing Contractor \$5,000 for travel of reviewers +</p>	<p>10/98 10/98</p> <p>10/98</p> <p>Summer 2003</p>	<p>Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) sent to USED for first peer review October 2000</p> <p>Record of those standards writing sessions; on file</p> <p>New document demonstrating alignment and exemplars</p>	<p>Contractor, plus BJ Granbery, Title I Director</p> <p>Linda Peterson, Division Administrator for Accreditation</p> <p>Contractor, Judy Snow, Assessment Director; Linda Peterson, Division Administrator for Accreditation; BJ Granbery, Title I Director, Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability</p>
Document how performance descriptors are aligned with the content standards.	Testing Contractor and OPI Staff	Fall 2003	Same document as above, plus consultant	Contractor, Judy Snow, Assessment Director; Linda

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.0	*Cost/Status	Date	Evidence	Person(s)
	work +		analysis	Peterson, Division Administrator for Accreditation; BJ Granbery, Title I Director, Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability
Document that performance descriptors are challenging for all students.	Testing Contractor and OPI Staff work +	Fall 2003	Same as above plus ARM; send to USED	Contractor, Judy Snow, Assessment Director; Linda Peterson, Division Administrator for Accreditation; BJ Granbery, Title I Director, Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability
Document that all students are held to the same high performance descriptors.	Testing Contractor and OPI staff work +	Fall 2003	Same as above plus ARM; sent to USED	Contractor, Judy Snow, Assessment Director; Linda Peterson, Division Administrator for Accreditation; BJ Granbery, Title I Director, Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability
Documentation that the state has formally approved the performance descriptors.	Testing Contractor and OPI staff work +	Fall 2003	ARM; send to USED	Contractor, Judy Snow, Assessment Director; Linda Peterson, Division Administrator for Accreditation; BJ Granbery, Title I Director, Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability
Review performance descriptors and exemplars based on assessment results and set cut scores on assessments by	Testing Contractor,	Summer 2004	Work conducted;	Contractor, Judy Snow,

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.0	*Cost/Status	Date	Evidence	Person(s)
conducting previously selected procedures	OPI staff, and selected school staff work. \$5,000 for school staff time and travel. +		participants and consultants paid as necessary; cut scores produced; send to USED	Assessment Director; Linda Peterson, Division Administrator for Accreditation; BJ Granbery, Title I Director, Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability
Documentation that the state has formally approved the performance cut scores.	OPI Staff work +	Fall 2004	Documents approved internally at OPI and reviewed by Title I Committee of Practitioners and Assessment Advisory Committees	Judy Snow, Assessment Director; Linda Peterson, Division Administrator for Accreditation; BJ Granbery, Title I Director, Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability
Documentation sent to the USED for formal peer review of performance standards, along with entire set of assessment evidence for peer review.	OPI Staff work +	October 2004	Documents shipped, proof of receipt required; copies retained at OPI	Judy Snow, Assessment Director

Topic 3.0: Reporting, Dissemination, and Using Testing Results in schools, LEAs, and the State

Current Status: Since Montana does not yet have USED approved performance standards, individual student reports (Phase 1, NRT only) are now based only on national percentile ranks, stanines and percent of items correct as related to Montana Content Standards, which does not allow for a technically adequate assessment of student performance relative to the State performance standards.

Data from Phase 1, the Iowa Tests, has been disaggregated by all federally required categories for the first time using the spring 2001 data by school, district, and state. This data has been disseminated to districts and the news media and is posted on the OPI website. (November 2001)

Goal 1.0: To ensure that assessments provide individual student interpretive and descriptive reports that let parents know how well their students, served by Title I, are meeting the performance standards set by the State. The steps below pertain to reports for Title I only at this time.

Key to symbols used in charts:
+ On time
- Not on time
Done

*All costs to be adjusted upward as necessary to include all students grades 4, 8 and 11.

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.0	<u>Date</u>	<u>*Cost/Status</u>	<u>Evidence</u>	<u>Person(s)</u>
Documentation that the state provides individual information from the State assessment showing how well each student has performed relative to the content and performance standards–proposed template.	Fall 2003	Contractor and OPI Staff work +	Proposed template; send to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; Contractor
Description of the state’s monitoring process to ensure the quality of all reports.	September 2003	Contractor and OPI Staff work +	Actual Monitoring document; send to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; Contractor
Description of strategies to ensure that individual reports go to all parents in understandable ways.	October, 2003	Contractor and OPI Staff work +	Individual report design with narrative; send to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; Contractor
Submit manuals and/or guidelines on the interpretation of these reports with entire assessment package for peer review.	October, 2004	Contractor and OPI Staff work +	Actual Manuals or Guidelines; send to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; Contractor

Goals 1.1: To ensure that assessment results are disaggregated within each State, local educational agency, and school.

The Title I statute spells out the categories for reporting results, including by gender, major racial and ethnic groups, English proficiency status, and migrant status. It also requires that students with disabilities be compared to non-disabled students, and economically disadvantaged students be compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged.

Key to symbols used in charts:
+ On time
- Not on time
Done
*All costs to be adjusted upward as necessary to include all students grades 4, 8 and 11.

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.1	<u>*Cost/Status</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Evidence</u>	<u>Person(s)</u>
Design a reporting template that has all required categories of disaggregated student achievement by performance level.	Testing Contractor and OPI Staff work	Summer and Fall 2003	Proposed template; send to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability;

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.1	*Cost/Status	Date	Evidence	Person(s)
	+			Contractor
Describe procedures for annually reporting these results	Contractor and OPI Staff work +	Summer and Fall 2003	Description of procedures; send to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; Contractor
Submit reporting policies for small groups.	Contractor and OPI Staff work +	Summer and Fall 2003	Actual policy document; send to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; Contractor

Goal 1.2: To ensure that all participating LEAs produce individual school, district, and State performance profiles for all their participating schools.

Key to symbols used in charts:
+ On time
- Not on time
Done
*All costs to be adjusted upward as necessary to include all students grades 4, 8 and 11.

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.2	*Cost/Status	Date	Evidence	Person(s)
Design and provide a reporting template for school, district, and state profiles that clearly communicates to educators, parents and stakeholders how the assessments relate to the content and performance standards.	Contractor and OPI staff work ±	Fall 2003	Proposed template; send to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability ; Contractor
Provide a work plan and timeline for development and dissemination of profiles for every district and school.	Contractor and OPI staff work +	Fall 2003	Actual Work plan and Timeline	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; Contractor
Documentation that LEAs publicize and disseminate the profiles to all the required audiences.	Contractor and OPI staff work +	Fall 2004	Actual Profiles disseminated by LEAs posted on OPI website; send example and link to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; Contractor
Submit school, LEA, and state profiles containing data disaggregated by all required categories.	Contractor and OPI Staff	December 2004	Actual Profiles	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.2	*Cost/Status	Date	Evidence	Person(s)
	work +			for Accountability ; Contractor
Document that all students are included in the school profiles including exempted students, special education students taking the alternate assessment and LEP students.	Contractor and OPI Staff work +	December 2004	Participation Rates and posting of profiles on website; send rates to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability ; Contractor

Topic 4.0: School and District Accountability

Goal 1.0: Develop an accountability system that reviews annually the progress of each school and district receiving Title I funds to determine whether that school or district is meeting or making adequate progress toward enabling its students to meet the State's student performance standards.

Overall Measurable Outcomes and Verification for Goal 1.0	Cost/Status	Date	Evidence	Person(s)
Develop a definition of adequate yearly progress that requires continuous improvement toward the goal of all students reaching proficiency.	T.A. from Contractor; OPI staff time	Fall 2004	AYP Guide	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; BJ Granbery, Title I Director
Describe how the State assessments are defined as the primary element in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress for schools and districts	Contractor; OPI staff time	Fall 2004	AYP Guide	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; BJ Granbery, Title I Director
Document that all students are included in the accountability systems including special education students taking the alternate assessment, other special education students, 504 students, and LEP students.	Contractor; OPI staff time	Fall 2004	Participation rates	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; Judy Snow, Assessment Director
Demonstrate approval of this definition of AYP by the committee of practitioners if it is a Title I only system or by other means if it is a State system	OPI staff time	Fall 2004	C.O.P. minutes/other minutes	BJ Granbery, Title I Director
Submit the definition of adequate yearly progress to USED for peer review.	OPI Staff time	December 2004	Definition and Explanatory Documentation shipped to USED	Tom Rogers, Division Administrator for Accountability; BJ Granbery, Title I Director
TOTAL COSTS OVER THREE YEAR PERIOD	\$600,000*			

*All costs to be adjusted upward as necessary to include all students in grades 4, 8 and 11.

APPENDIX G

(Will insert PDF file which contains pamphlet)

APPENDIX H

(Will insert PDF files which contains reading, math and science content standards)

APPENDIX I

18-5-601. Findings -- policy. (1) The legislature finds that:

(a) the advent of the information age throughout the United States and around the world has resulted in lasting changes in information technology;

(b) the use of interactive visual display terminals by the state is becoming a widespread means of access for public employees and the public to obtain information available electronically, but nonvisual access, whether by speech, Braille, or other appropriate means, has not been systematically incorporated into the procurement process for new information technology;

(c) presentation of electronic data solely in a visual format is a barrier to access by individuals who are blind or visually impaired, preventing them from participating on equal terms in crucial areas of life, such as education and employment;

(d) alternatives, including both software and hardware adaptations, have been created so that interactive control of computers and the use of the information presented are possible by both visual and nonvisual means;

(e) the goals of the state in obtaining and deploying new forms of technology properly include universal access so that segments of society with particular needs, including individuals who are unable to use visual displays, will not be left out of the information age; and

(f) although access to programs, technology, and information is provided for under other state and federal law and, in many instances, compels the installation and availability of nonvisual technology adaptations, access to information technology is most effectively accomplished at the point of procurement, ensuring that funds are expended on information technology designed to be readily adaptable for nonvisual access.

(2) It is the policy of this state that all state programs and activities be conducted in accordance with the following principles:

(a) Individuals who are blind or visually impaired have the right to full participation in the life of the state, including the use of information technology that is provided by the state for use by employees, program participants, and the public.

(b) Technology purchased in whole or in part with funds provided by the state that is to be used for the creation, storage, retrieval, or dissemination of information and that is intended for use by employees, program participants, and the public must be accessible to and usable by individuals who are blind or visually impaired.

History: En. Sec. 1, Ch. 429, L. 2001.

(Will insert Montana Assessment Scales in PDF format)



OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

PO BOX 202501
HELENA MT 59620-2501
www.opi.state.mt.us
(406) 444-3095
888-231-9393
(406) 444-0169 (TTY)

Linda McCulloch
Superintendent

MEMORANDUM

To: Montana School Administrators
From: Cathy Kendall, Director, Coordinated School Health
Date: 6/12/2002
Re: ESEA Unsafe School Choice Option

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (ESEA) provides, in part:

"SEC. 9532. UNSAFE SCHOOL CHOICE OPTION.

"(a) UNSAFE SCHOOL CHOICE POLICY.--Each State receiving funds under this Act shall establish and implement a statewide policy requiring that a student attending a persistently dangerous public elementary school or secondary school, as determined by the State in consultation with a representative sample of local educational agencies, or who becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense, as determined by State law, while in or on the grounds of a public elementary school or secondary school that the student attends, be allowed to attend a safe public elementary school or secondary school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school.

"(b) CERTIFICATION.--As a condition of receiving funds under this Act, a State shall certify in writing to the Secretary that the State is in compliance with this section." PL 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425, 1984-1985 (2002) (emphasis added).

The Office of Public Instruction consulted with LEAs and associations involved with public education in Montana to determine a definition. Based on that consultation, the Office of Public Instruction developed the following definition of "persistently dangerous public elementary school or secondary school." This definition will be used in Montana to (a) establish State compliance with the federal requirement set forth in ESEA, and (b) determine if any Montana schools are "persistently dangerous" thus invoking the statutorily set requirement that students in the identified school be allowed to attend a safe public elementary or secondary school within the local education agency.

Pursuant to this Act, the Office of Public Instruction adopts this operational definition:

"Persistently Dangerous Public Elementary School Or Secondary School": In the context of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (ESEA), a Montana public elementary or secondary school is considered to be persistently dangerous if each of the following two conditions exist:

(a) in each of three consecutive years, the school has a federal or state gun-free schools violation or a violent criminal offense has been committed on school property, and

(b) in any two years within a three-year period, the school has experienced expulsions for drug, alcohol, weapons or violence that exceed one of the following rates –

(1) more than five expulsions for a school of less than 250 students,

(2) more than ten expulsions for a school of more than 250 students but less than 1,000 students, or

(3) more than fifteen expulsions for a school of more than 1,000 students.

For the purpose of this definition, a "violent criminal offense" shall mean homicide, rape, robbery and/or aggravated assault.

ESEA reference: Title IX, Part E – Uniform Provisions, Subpart 2, Section 9532
(specifically identified as the Unsafe School Choice Option)
PL 107-110, Sec. 9531, 115 Stat. 1425, 1984-1985.

For additional information or questions, please call Cathy Kendall at 444-0829 (cakendall@state.mt.us) or Rick Chiotti at 444-1963 (rchiotti@state.mt.us).

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM (CSR) PROGRAM

SECTION I GENERAL INFORMATION

District Name	Project Starting Date	Project Ending Date
Authorized Representative's Name	Title	Telephone: FAX: Email:
Address	City	ZIP
Applicant School Name or Consortium of Schools:		

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct and the local Board of Trustees has authorized me, as its representative, to file this application. The Board of Trustees agrees to the Common Assurances on file with the OPI in regard to this grant.

Signature of Authorized Representative Date

The Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) Program provides funds to help state and local education officials identify and adopt high-quality, well-defined, and well-documented comprehensive school reform programs that show the most promise of enabling children in the lowest performing schools to meet challenging state content and performance standards and that are based on reliable research and effective practices.

Research on effective schools points to the importance of collaboration and mutual respect among school staff, effective leadership, sustained and high quality professional development, efficient school management, active parental and community involvement, and ongoing program evaluation. Fragmented or piecemeal efforts at school reform often fall short of the stated goals. Comprehensive school improvement strategies that involve the total school community through sincere, active, coordinated efforts over several years have demonstrated remarkable success. Schools across the US, once identified as low performing schools, are now recognized among the highest performing schools in their state and nation.

The Office of Public Instruction has established an absolute priority for schools that have reported an average NCE score of 44 or below in Reading and Math for the last two years for grades 4, 8, or 11.

Each successful applicant school will be funded at a minimum of \$50,000 per year. The legislation states that initial awards will be renewable for an additional two years. The OPI expects to fund up to 6 new school projects during this competition. Inter-district or intra-district school consortia may be formed as an applicant, as long as the total number of students does not exceed 500.

Date Received by OPI:		
Date Approved:	_____	Date
Amount of Award:	Reviewer's Signature	Date

Purpose of Application

The purpose of this application is to assist school districts and schools in the development of a comprehensive approach to school reform through the adoption of research-based models that show the most promise of enabling “**all students**”^{*} to meet challenging state content and performance standards. Decades of research on school improvement have demonstrated that comprehensive improvement programs, encompassing teaching strategies, learning materials, school organization, administrative techniques, assessment systems, and staff development, coupled with parent and community involvement, lead to better and more sustained student achievement than do piecemeal fragmented improvement packages unconnected to the school's entire program.

The contributions of educational research have been very important in recent efforts to improve education for all students. As the evidence supporting comprehensive approaches to school improvement has grown, a national consensus has emerged around the need for greater accountability for school outcomes measured against state content and performance standards that are aligned with state and local assessments of student learning. In this context, the specific purpose of the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) Program is to help Montana schools adopt a comprehensive model for schoolwide change covering virtually all aspects of school operations, rather than a piecemeal, fragmented approach to school improvement. For purposes of this application, please refer to descriptions of research-based comprehensive school reform models that are available in various catalogs and also posted on the WWW.

Information on current CSR sites in Montana and across the United States is available at www.sedl.org/CSRD or by contacting the CSR Program at the Office of Public Instruction, 406-444-2080 or rlukenbill@state.mt.us.

Eligible Schools in Montana

The amended Montana State Plan for the Comprehensive School Reform Program establishes an absolute priority for any school that has reported an average NCE score of 44 or below in Reading and Math for grades 4, 8, or 11 for the last two years. Furthermore, only one school in a district will be funded under each year's competition, except that schools within the district or from districts in the surrounding geographic area may join together to form a consortium to be funded (minimum of \$50,000), as long as the total number of students does not exceed 500. Up to four schools or consortia will be funded from this part of the competition.

Review of Applications

A panel of field reviewers will review and score each application using the **Scoring Rubric** included as **Appendix A**. Each application will be reviewed by two readers. In the event the two scores differ by more than 30 points, a third reader will review the application and three scores will be used to determine an average score for the application. Applications with an average score below 103 will not be funded. Applicants are encouraged to review their own completed application using the **Scoring Rubric** prior to submitting the application to the Office of Public Instruction.

^{*} For purposes of this application “**all students**” means that programs are designed to enable and encourage male and female student from a broad range of backgrounds and circumstances to participate. **This includes disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students with diverse racial, ethnic or cultural backgrounds.** Programs for “**all students**” ensure that everyone receives an equal opportunity to participate in programs provided for under the Comprehensive School Reform Program and *each application must address how the unique needs of each of these student groups will be met.*

Section II District Narrative

Local education agencies (LEAs) responsible for school(s) eligible for funding under the provisions of the Comprehensive School Reform Program should submit a narrative outlining the scope and specifications of their intended technical and administrative support services for the school(s) within the LEA. The narrative should include a description of, and a timeline for, the district's activities related to:

1. Technical assistance for school to support and facilitate planning, implementation, and evaluation of the school's application; narrative should include district description of why district staff believe the model chosen would be a good match between the model and the school improvement plan and how the model fits the overall plan for district-wide reform;
2. Professional assistance for schools to facilitate staff development training to support the implementation and instructional success of planned education programs;
3. Consultation and supervisory assistance for school to help monitor, review, and assess the operational effectiveness of education programs, and;
4. Audit services for schools to facilitate accurate accounting and reporting of their program's operational costs and accomplishments.

Section III Individual School Narrative

In order to provide the Montana Office of Public Instruction with information, by which an informed decision can be made, the application narrative must describe how the proposed CSR program will address the components described below as a comprehensive plan, which builds upon current resources of the school and is not a separate add-on program.

The match between the goals of the comprehensive school program plan and the selected research-based model(s) should be consistent with local needs as identified in a recent needs assessment.

1. Describe how the school's adoption of this plan and model(s) will help to employ proven strategies and methods for student learning, teaching, and school management that are based on scientifically based research and effective practices and have been replicated successfully in other schools with similar characteristics. As a part of this component, the application should consider whether the chosen model has been successfully implemented at other sites, whether the model is replicable in a wide range of settings, what research foundation supports the claims of the model developer, and what evaluation techniques have been used to show the effectiveness of the model. Please see *Appendix B* in this application for a Continuum of Evidence of Effectiveness, which is followed by various examples from different schools as they attempted to describe the effectiveness of their chosen research-based models.
2. Explain how the school's adoption of this plan and model(s) incorporates a comprehensive design for effective school functioning, including instruction, assessment, classroom management, and professional development, that align with the school's curriculum, technology, and professional development into a schoolwide reform plan

designed to enable all students to meet challenging state content and performance standards and addresses needs identified through a school needs assessment. Explain how the plan is a cohesive whole.

3. Describe how the school's adoption of the plan and model provides for high-quality and continuous teacher and staff professional development. Provide timelines, names of responsible person(s), and classroom support that will guide professional development in the school.
4. Describe the measurable goals for student academic achievement and benchmarks for meeting those goals during the project period.
5. Demonstrate how school faculty, administrators, and staff support the plan and model(s).
6. Describe how the school's adoption of this plan and model(s) provides support for teachers, principals, administrators, and other school personnel during the planning and implementation, and evaluation of this CSR program.
7. Describe how the school's adoption of this plan and model(s) provides for the meaningful involvement of parents and the local community in planning, implementing, and evaluating the school improvement activities of this CSR program.
8. Describe the school's plan to utilize high-quality external technical support and assistance from an entity (which may be a university) that has experience and expertise in schoolwide reform.
9. Describe the process that the school will utilize to evaluate the comprehensive school reform effort and the results achieved by students. Describe how the state assessment system and evaluations conducted by an external evaluator and/or the model developer will be used to measure success of the school reform effort.
10. Describe how CSR funds to support this application will be used by completing the attached ***Budget Summary for CSRD Funds***. Describe how other resources available to the school (federal, state, local, and private) will be utilized to support this application by completing the attached ***Budget Summary for Other Funds***.
11. Describe how this CSR program, using scientifically based research, will significantly improve the academic achievement of participating students, especially in the content area(s) that were found to be less than proficient.
12. Provide a timeline for the entire proposed implementation of the school reform plan. Include names of key personnel responsible for each component.
13. Provide verification that the model developer(s) will be willing and able to provide services at your site should your application be funded, i.e., a letter of intent to provide the requested services on the letterhead of model developer(s).

Each school's application should contain information that shows how the school will increase student achievement. These strategies can be included within the above listed components and must be identifiable to the reader.

With each school's application, the school should identify a plan to inform the school community, parents, and the general public of the activities supported with Comprehensive School Reform Program funds.

An electronic version of this application is available by request. Send an email request to rlukenbill@state.mt.us for a copy of the MS Word version.

MONTANA OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Rubrics to be used in scoring applications for funding under the Comprehensive School Reform Program

Rubrics describe how the scoring method is to be used. By sharing the scoring rubric with each applicant, it is clear there are no “hidden agendas” and that each applicant will have an equal chance to score well. Each will know exactly what is necessary in order to achieve the highest scores.

Scoring Guide

- Excellent – 3** This response is well written, clear, and understandable. I know exactly what the applicant is proposing, and understand how it fits into the proposal and meets the needs of comprehensive school reform for this school.
- Good – 2** This response is good, providing the basics of what I need to know. I have a general feel for what the applicant is proposing and how it fits into the proposal and meets the needs of comprehensive school reform for this school.
- Minimal – 1** This response includes the minimum response necessary. It provides some minimal information about what the applicant is proposing and how it fits into the proposal and meets the needs of comprehensive school reform for this school.
- Not Found – 0** There appears to be no real response to this portion of the item, or it is so unclear and missing pieces that I don't see where the applicant is going with the idea.

Note to reviewers:

Please add comments in the appropriate spaces if you think it might help clarify your scoring. The form has been developed to be an easy-to-use checklist (just check the appropriate box). Scoring forms will be made available to all applicants.

Remember: A response can be brief and good; a response can be long-winded with no information in it. Read quickly but carefully.

Thank you for your assistance in this important process of reviewing applications submitted to the Comprehensive School Reform Program.

Section I: Applicant School/Consortium Name

Section II: District Narrative

Component	Item	Excellent (3)	Good (2)	Minimal (1)	Not Found (0)
1. Technical Assistance	District supports planning of school's application.				
	District supports implementation of school's program plan.				
	District supports evaluation of school's program plan.				
	Why model(s) selected is best match for school improvement program.				
	How model(s) fit overall district-wide reform efforts.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 15

2. Professional Assistance	District facilitates staff development at school level.				
	District training supports implementation of school program.				
	District training supports instructional success of school program.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 9

3. Consultation/ Supervisory Assistance	Monitor operational effectiveness				
	Review operational effectiveness				
	Assess operational effectiveness				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 9

Component	Item	Excellent (3)	Good (2)	Minimal (1)	Not Found (0)
4. Audit Services	District facilitates accurate accounting/reporting of costs.				
	District facilitates accurate accounting/reporting of accomplishments.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 6

5. Timeline	Includes a timeline for district to work with the school.				
	Includes specific activities that the district will provide.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 6

Section III: School Narrative

1. Research Basis and Effective Practices	Addresses student level achievement.				
	Addresses teacher level instruction.				
	Replicated in schools with characteristics similar to target school.				
	Evaluation methods to be used in target school.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 12

2. Comprehensive Program Design for Effective School Reform using research-based models and practices	Addresses needs identified through a recent school needs assessment and review of student achievement data.				
	Instruction, assessment, classroom management, technology and professional development are aligned with curriculum.				
	Schoolwide reform program that enables all students to meet challenging state content and performance standards.				
	Match between school needs and model(s) selected.				
	Leadership and management of comprehensive program.				
	The reform program plan is a cohesive whole.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 18

Component	Item	Excellent (3)	Good (2)	Minimal (1)	Not Found (0)
3. Professional Development	High-quality, ongoing, results-based professional development.				
	Plan includes timelines, responsible person(s), and classroom support for professional development.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 6

4. Measurable Goals	Measurable goals for student performance.				
	Annual benchmarks for meeting goals.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 6

5. School Support	Evidence of support from teachers, administrators, and other school support staff.				
------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 3

6. Family and Community Support	Evidence of parent/family involvement in planning.				
	Plans for family involvement in implementing program.				
	Record of community involvement in planning school improvement activities.				
	Plans for community involvement in implementing program.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 12

Component	Item	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
		Excellent	Good	Minimal	Not Found
7. External Support	Plan to use high quality assistance from an external entity.				
	External entity's expertise/experience in schoolwide reform.				
	External entity's demonstrated commitment to provide technical assistance to program.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 9

8. Evaluation	Description of the program evaluation plan.				
	Strategy for formative evaluation/modification of plan.				
	Description of how state assessment data will be used, including data management and data disaggregation to guide program.				
	Describe the evaluation plan of the model developer(s).				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 12

9. Resources	Describe how CSRD funds will be used to support this school reform effort.				
	Describe how other federal, state, local, and/or private funds will be used to support this school reform effort.				
	Describe how school/district funds will be used to maintain this school reform effort after CSRD funding has ended.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 9

10. Timeline	Include a month-by-month timeline of major activities, events, and products of this program, including names of responsible persons.				
	Timeline is for the entire reform plan, not just pieces of the effort.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 6

Component	Item	Excellent (3)	Good (2)	Minimal (1)	Not Found (0)
11. Model Program Developer	Describe the support offered by the model program developer(s)				
	Include the letter of support.				

Comments:

Number of points scored _____ / 6

ADDITIONAL DATA REQUIREMENTS: OPI WILL COMPLETE THIS SECTION

		Reading		Math		Points
Percentage of students with scores below the proficient level. (stanines 1-4)		1999	2000	1999	2000	
	Grade 4					
	Grade 8					
	Grade 11					

Score 3 points if percentage is greater than 40% in both areas, both years.

Number of points scored _____ / 3

Score 1 point if percentage is greater than 40% in only one area, and/or in only one year.

**Total number of points scored _____ / 147
(A minimum score of 103 points (70% of total) is necessary.)**

COMMENTS ON THE TOTAL APPLICATION:

**COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM
PROGRAM
LOCAL EVALUATION REPORT**

Interim Report (due May 30) _____
Final Report (due Nov 10) _____

SCHOOL BUILDING NAME	SCHOOL DISTRICT	NAME OF PERSON PREPARING THIS REPORT	DATE
ADDRESS		TITLE	TELEPHONE
		E-MAIL	FAX
Name of Comprehensive School Reform Design Model(s)			

Montana Office of Public Instruction will complete this section:

Legal Entity No.	School Code	Project No.
Grade Span	Number Of Students	School Category
Title I Eligible Building? No Yes	Title I Program Improvement District/Building? No Yes	ESEA Schoolwide Building ? No Yes
Funding Source: ___ Title I CSR Program Funds ___ FIE CSR Program Funds		
Percent Free and Reduced Lunch October _____%	Name of Principal: Email address:	

Instructions

The purpose of the Montana Comprehensive School Reform Program (CSR) evaluation report is to monitor and document CSR program implementation, to assess progress toward expected outcomes, and to determine overall program effectiveness in improving student achievement. Each local CSR school is responsible for developing a process it will use to evaluate CSR efforts and expected results achieved by students. CSR evaluation results will be collected annually through the use of this report.

- Please complete the entire report with relevant evaluation information. ***You are encouraged to have your CSD team of staff, parents, community members, and district administrators jointly discuss, review, and complete this report.***
- Submit completed evaluation reports and supporting documents to Ron Lukenbill, the State's CSR Team Leader, no later than the date listed at the top of this page in 2002 and by the same date of each year during the project award period.

**Ron Lukenbill, Team Leader
Comprehensive School Reform Program
Office of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501
Phone: (406) 444-2080 Email: rlukenbill@state.mt.us**

Section One Student Performance and Achievement

State Assessment Measures

- Montana Standardized Test Scores.** *This is the format used to chart the percent of students by stanine group in reading, language arts, mathematics, science and social studies. Record assessment results relevant to your building's grade span. **These results will be used to measure yearly academic progress.** Spring 2001 will be the baseline year. Please refer to Fall Report Student Assessment to complete this section of the report.*

<i>Refer to Fall Report Student Assessment (10.55.603 and 10.56.101)</i>										
Reading							Percentage of students by stanine group			
Grade Level	Year	Test Name	Test Edition/Form, Year of Test	February Enrollment	Number Tested	Avg NCE	Stanine 1-3	Stanine 4	Stanine 5-7	Stanine 8-9
4	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
8	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
11	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									

Section One, State Assessment Measures, Continued

<i>Refer to Fall Report Student Assessment (10.55.603 and 10.56.101)</i>										
Mathematics							Percentage of students by stanine group			
Grade Level	Year	Test Name	Test Edition/Form, Year of Test	February Enrollment	Number Tested	Avg NCE	Stanine 1-3	Stanine 4	Stanine 5-7	Stanine 8-9
4	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
8	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
11	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									

<i>Refer to Fall Report Student Assessment (10.55.603 and 10.56.101)</i>										
Language Arts							Percentage of students by stanine group			
Grade Level	Year	Test Name	Test Edition/Form, Year of Test	February Enrollment	Number Tested	Avg NCE	Stanine 1-3	Stanine 4	Stanine 5-7	Stanine 8-9
4	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
8	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
11	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									

Section One, State Assessment Measures, Continued

<i>Refer to Fall Report Student Assessment (10.55.603 and 10.56.101)</i>										
Science							Percentage of students by stanine group			
Grade Level	Year	Test Name	Test Edition/Form, Year of Test	February Enrollment	Number Tested	Avg NCE	Stanine 1-3	Stanine 4	Stanine 5-7	Stanine 8-9
4	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
8	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
11	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									

<i>Refer to Fall Report Student Assessment (10.55.603 and 10.56.101)</i>										
Social Studies							Percentage of students by stanine group			
Grade Level	Year	Test Name	Test Edition/Form, Year of Test	February Enrollment	Number Tested	Avg NCE	Stanine 1-3	Stanine 4	Stanine 5-7	Stanine 8-9
4	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
8	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									
11	2000/2001									
	2001/2002									
	2002/2003									

Section One Continued

Local Student Performance Measures

- Attendance (Average Daily Attendance).** The attendance rate is computed by taking the aggregate daily attendance during the regular school year and dividing by the aggregate daily membership for the school year, and expressing the result as a percentage. The aggregate daily attendance is the sum of the days present of all students when school is in session during the school year. The aggregate daily membership is the sum of the days present and absent of all students when school is in session during the school year. In-service days are not included in the computations. A student is considered present if physically present at the school or engaged in a school activity even if the activity is away from the school. **Use data from Fall Report.**

2000/2001	2001/2002	2002/2003
____ % average daily attendance	____ % average daily attendance	____ % average daily attendance

- Graduation rate. (Secondary programs only.)** Please fill in your graduation rate. The graduation rate is computed by adding the number of graduates receiving a regular diploma on the last day of school to the number of mid-year graduates and previous summer graduates, and dividing by the 12th grade membership on the last day of school plus the number of mid-year graduates and the previous summer graduates. **Use data from Fall Report.**

2000/2001	2001/2002	2002/2003
____ % graduation rate	____ % graduation rate	____ % graduation rate

- Dropout rate. (Secondary programs only.)** The dropout rate is computed by dividing the number of dropouts in the current school year by the number of students enrolled by the October enrollment date of the current school year. **Use data from Montana Dropout Report.**

2000/2001	2001/2002	2002/2003
____ % dropout rate	____ % dropout rate	____ % dropout rate

Section One Continued

School Demographics

<i>STUDENTS</i>			
<i>Use data from Fall school report. Mark N/A for data not available.</i>	<i>School Year</i>		
	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
% American Indian			
% Asian/Pacific Islander			
% Hispanic			
% Black, Non-Hispanic			
% White, Non-Hispanic			
% LEP			
% Special Education			
% Students with Disabilities			

<i>INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF</i>			
<i>Use data from Fall school report. Mark N/A for data not available.</i>	<i>School Year</i>		
	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
FTE New Certified Staff			
FTE Certified Staff Total			
FTE New Paraprofessional Staff			
FTE Paraprofessional Staff Total			

<i>KEY ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF</i>			
<i>Refer to Fall Personnel Report to state/district. Mark N/A for data not available.</i>	<i>School Year</i>		
	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
FTE New Administrative Staff			
FTE Administrative Staff Total			

Section Two Student Performance Goals and Program Objectives

- **Progress in meeting student performance goals and objectives.** These local assessment measures may be embedded in the adopted CSRD model or identified in the school’s CSRD plan (refer to Section III, #4 of your school’s CSRD application).

<i>Proposed Goal(s)</i>	<i>Measures & Assessments Used</i>	<i>Results to Date (Achieved, Partially Achieved, Needs Attention)</i>	<i>Check if Documentation is Attached</i>
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention	<input type="checkbox"/>
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention	<input type="checkbox"/>
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention	<input type="checkbox"/>
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention	<input type="checkbox"/>
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section Two

EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION COMPONENTS

Instructions

Each local school’s Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program must describe how the implementation of its local reform effort will be evaluated. The following components, based upon the nine federal requirements for comprehensive school reform, should provide the framework for this evaluation.

- Please indicate your progress toward implementing each component of your school’s CSRD program as follows:
 - 5** Completed as Planned
 - 4** Completed with Modification
 - 3** Progressing as Planned
 - 2** Initial Implementation
 - 1** Needs Attention

- Please provide supporting documentation, such as survey results, strategic plans, assessments, graphs, project timelines, etc. to substantiate your evaluation of program implementation and progress.

<i>COMPONENT</i>	<i>Progress Indicator (1-5)</i>	<i>Supporting Materials Attached (☑)</i>
EFFECTIVE, RESEARCH-BASED METHODS AND STRATEGIES. How has your school implemented the design model(s) and integrated it with the comprehensive reform plan? (If more than one design model is included in program, duplicate this section as necessary.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CSRD model has been fully implemented according to the design specifications of the model developer. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific steps and approaches prescribed by the adopted research-based models and methods have been used and monitored to ensure program fidelity. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of adopted model has complimented the school’s comprehensive reform plan. 		

Summarize degree of implementation to date (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

Section Two

Evaluation of Implementation Components

PROGRESS 5 – Completed as Planned 3 – Progressing as Planned 1 – Needs Attention
 SCALE: 4 – Completed with Modification 2 – Initial Implementation

<i>COMPONENT</i>	<i>Progress Indicator (1-5)</i>	<i>Supporting Materials Attached</i> (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)
------------------	---------------------------------	---

COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN WITH ALIGNED COMPONENTS

How has your school’s CSRD plan assured that there is a comprehensive approach aligning all school programs and resources with the adopted model(s)? (If more than one design model is included in program, duplicate this section as necessary.)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific steps have been taken to align instruction, assessment, curriculum, technology, and professional development into a coherent, schoolwide effort to improve student achievement. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program plans encompass the whole school not limited to particular grade levels, subjects, students, or teachers. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comprehensive school reform program is using specific strategies to ensure that all students meet or exceed state standards. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comprehensive school reform program has accommodated the needs of children with special needs. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps have been taken to align classroom curriculum and instruction with state content standards. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps have been taken to coordinate other school programs and grants (i.e., Technology and Literacy, Eisenhower Science and Math). 		

Summarize how your school has been restructured for reform (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

Section Two

Evaluation of Implementation Components

PROGRESS SCALE: 5 – Completed as Planned 3 – Progressing as Planned 1 – Needs Attention
 4 – Completed with Modification 2 – Initial Implementation

<i>COMPONENT</i>	<i>Progress Indicator (1-5)</i>	<i>Supporting Materials Attached (☑)</i>
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT How has your professional development program satisfied the CSRD program goals and faculty/staff needs? How has your school determined if professional development activities have created change in classroom practices and teacher effectiveness?		
• Specific, continuous professional development activities have been conducted to carry out the reform effort.		
• Appropriate assessment instruments have been used to measure changes in teacher effectiveness.		
• Appropriate assessment instruments have been used to measure the quality of professional development.		
• Specific processes have been used to document and monitor the alignment of professional development activities and teacher outcomes.		
• Leadership training for principals and administrators has been conducted as part of professional development activities.		
• Sufficient monies have been dedicated and used to provide professional development.		

Summarize the nature and extent of professional development in your school (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

Section Two

Evaluation of Implementation Components

PROGRESS 5 – Completed as Planned 3 – Progressing as Planned 1 – Needs Attention
 SCALE: 4 – Completed with Modification 2 – Initial Implementation

<i>COMPONENT</i>	<i>Progress Indicator (1-5)</i>	<i>Supporting Materials Attached (✓)</i>
------------------	---------------------------------	--

SUPPORT WITHIN THE SCHOOL
 How has your school determined whether there is continued staff, faculty, and administration support for the CSRD program throughout the year?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific steps have been taken to ensure continuing support for the CSRD program on the part of the staff. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School management has provided support to sustain comprehensive school reform efforts. 		

Summarize the degree of faculty, staff, and administrator support in your school (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

PARENTAL AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
 How has your school’s CSRD plan provided opportunities for meaningful involvement of parents and the local community in planning and implementing comprehensive school reform?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific strategies for meaningful parent and community involvement have been identified and carried out during this project year. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program has been re-examined with the participation of parents, teachers, and community members to ensure that your school is making progress toward its CSRD goals. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-parent compacts have been jointly developed with parents. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps have been taken to consider and incorporate cultural standards and values into our school’s comprehensive reform policies & plans. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps have been taken to annually update our school’s parent involvement plan and policies. 		

Summarize the nature and extent of parent/community involvement in your school’s CSRD efforts (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

Section Two

Evaluation of Implementation Components

PROGRESS SCALE: 5 – Completed as Planned 3 – Progressing as Planned 1 – Needs Attention
 4 – Completed with Modification 2 – Initial Implementation

<i>COMPONENT</i>	<i>Progress Indicator (1-5)</i>	<i>Supporting Materials Attached (✓)</i>
EXTERNAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT		
How has your school used technical support to enhance CSRD efforts?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality, external technical assistance has been provided to support the adoption and implementation of the CSRD plan (i.e., OPI, NWREL, other providers). 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The model developer has provided technical assistance and professional development to ensure successful implementation of the adopted CSRD model. 		

Summarize the nature, extent, and sources of technical support in your school (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

EVALUATION STRATEGIES		
How has your school carried out its evaluation plan to assess CSRD effectiveness and monitor program implementation?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive evaluation plan has been developed and used to monitor the progress of program implementation, student performance, and student achievement. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific local indicators have been identified and used to evaluate program implementation and fidelity. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific local indicators and benchmarks have been identified and used to evaluate student achievement and student performance. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school has adjusted its practices based on evaluation results. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient monies have been dedicated and used to perform a comprehensive evaluation of your school’s CSRD effort. 		

Summarize your evaluation process to date (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

Section Two

Evaluation of Implementation Components

PROGRESS 5 – Completed as Planned 3 – Progressing as Planned 1 – Needs Attention
 SCALE: 4 – Completed with Modification 2 – Initial Implementation

<i>COMPONENT</i>	<i>Progress Indicator (1-5)</i>	<i>Supporting Materials Attached</i> (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)
------------------	---------------------------------	---

DISTRICT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT

How has your district provided technical assistance, professional development, and support for the effective implementation of your school’s comprehensive school reform program?

- District policies and plans have provided all necessary resources and assistance to promote and sustain ongoing CSRD efforts.

Summarize your district’s CSRD support and assistance to date (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

Please describe your District’s recommitment to comprehensive school reform efforts for the upcoming project year (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

Section Two

Evaluation of Implementation Components

PROGRESS 5 – *Completed as Planned* 3 – *Progressing as Planned* 1 – *Needs Attention*
SCALE: 4 – *Completed with Modification* 2 – *Initial Implementation*

TIMELINE

Provide a timeline of CSRD activities and services described in your CSRD application that have occurred this project year and are planned for the next project year.

- The timeline of CSRD activities and services proposed for this project year has been adhered to.

Summarize your proposed timeline of CSRD activities, services, and strategies for the upcoming project year(s) (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

If changes have been made in timeline, describe changes and why they occurred (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

Please identify barriers your school has encountered this project year that has had an impact on implementation of your CSRD program:

Please identify factors that supported and facilitated implementation of your CSRD program this project year.

Please describe the steps taken to sustain your school's comprehensive school reform efforts. What decisions, policies or structures have been created to support comprehensive school reform beyond the grant period?

Please list the names of all members of your school's CSRD team who participated in completing this form.

<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principal
<input type="checkbox"/> Community Member(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> CSRD Facilitator/Coordinator
<input type="checkbox"/> Model Provider(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Parent(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Student(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Paraprofessional Staff
<input type="checkbox"/> District Staff
<input type="checkbox"/> Principal(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Technical Assistance Provider(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Coordinator(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Classified Staff
<input type="checkbox"/> Other

21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER
2002-2003

COVER SHEET

1.1 ORGANIZATION:

Name of Contact Person:

Telephone:

Mailing Address:

e-mail address:

Fax Number:

Authorized Signature

Date

Title:

■ Note: The general certifications and assurances that are signed and submitted by the district each spring will apply to this federally funded program.

_____ L Legal entity # (for school districts):
community orgs)

_____ FEIN # (for

\$ _____
Total Funding Requested

OPI Use Only

Project Number: _____

Date Received: _____

Project Approval: _____

Amount Awarded: \$ _____

PROGRAM SUMMARY AND ABSTRACT

Name and address of applicant:

Contact information:

Name:

Phone:

Fax:

e-mail:

Name of each school that will participate	Title I School wide Or SINI site	% Free or Reduced Lunch	# of students to be served	# of adults to be served
For the entire grant --	Total # of centers:	Average %:	Total:	Total:

Student Populations Served (check all that apply):

- Elementary School Middle School High School

Types of Community Partners (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> School and/or District | <input type="checkbox"/> County or Municipal Agencies (e.g., police, Parks & Recreation, Social Services) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> National Organizations (e.g., Boys & Girls Clubs, YMCA/YWCA, Big Brothers/Big Sisters) | <input type="checkbox"/> Colleges or Universities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community-Based Organizations (local non-profits or foundations) | <input type="checkbox"/> Faith-Based Organizations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Libraries or Museums | <input type="checkbox"/> Hospitals/Clinics/Health Providers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Businesses | |

List the name of each partner with the 21st Century Community Learning Center:

Services (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reading or Literacy | <input type="checkbox"/> Sports or Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Health, Nutrition |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology, Video or Media | <input type="checkbox"/> Youth Development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Science | <input type="checkbox"/> Community Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Services for Adults |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Art, Music, Dance, Theater | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Activities, Social Studies | |

Operating Hours: (check all that apply): Afterschool Weekend Summer Before school

Abstract. (In the space below, briefly describe the programs' goals, services and activities, and planned participants):

Prime Applicant District: <hr/>	<p><i>TITLE IV, PART B</i></p> <p><i>i. <u>21st Century Community Learning Center</u></i></p>
LE: <hr/>	

GOALS, INDICATORS, and PERFORMANCE TARGETS: Montana has adopted the following five goals and corresponding indicators. Each 21st Century CLC applicant must select a goal(s) from the following list and which indicators apply to their project. Data must be submitted that supports these selections.

<p style="text-align: center;">Performance Goals</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Instructions: Check all applicable boxes</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Performance Indicators</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Instructions: Check all applicable boxes</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.1 The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> 1.2 The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> 1.3 The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.1 The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year. <input type="checkbox"/> 2.2 The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for Performance Indicator 1.1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2.3 The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, as reported for Performance Indicator 2.1

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance Goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.1 The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.2 The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term "professional development," is defined in section 9101(34)).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.3 The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 4.1 The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Performance Goals Instructions: Check all applicable boxes</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Performance Indicators Instructions: Check all applicable boxes</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.1 The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, --disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; --calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.2 The percentage of students who drop out of school, -- --disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; --calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.</p> <p>(Note: NCES' definition of "high school dropout," i.e., a student in grades 9-12 who (a) was enrolled in the district at sometime during the previous school year; (b) was not enrolled at the beginning of the succeeding school year; (c) has not graduated or completed a program of studies by the maximum age established by the State; (d) has not transferred to another public school district or to a non-public school or to a State-approved educational program; and (e) has not left school because of death, illness, or school-approved absence.</p>

PROGRAM NARRATIVE (20 PAGES MAXIMUM)

S:\DRUGFREE\TITLE IV SDFSC 2002-2003\Title IVB 21st CCLC Performance Form.doc

1) Needs Assessments, Data Analysis and Academic Risk Factors (20 points)

Principle of Effectiveness (A) –Activities must be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the needs for before and after school programs (including during summer recess periods) and activities in the schools and communities. Provide a description of your community and the extent to which the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the academic needs of the target population. Grantees must provide academic enrichment activities to students to help the students meet State and local standards in the core content areas, such as reading, math, and science. In addition, applicants may provide services to the families of children who are served in the program.

1A) Needs Assessments, Data Analysis Cite the factors that place students at risk of educational failure, e.g., the poverty rates in the communities to be served, State assessment data, the percentage of Title I students, the dropout rates, and the literacy rates and education levels in the community. Use specific and relevant data regarding the students and family members to be served by the project and the needs of the community.

10 points	Specific objective data related to the academic needs of the target population and has been collected analyzed and is clearly identified. Multiple (three or more) data sources have been used to determine the factors that place students at risk of educational failure. Local data analysis clearly demonstrates needs.
5points	National and/or State data has been referenced, but not analyzed, clearly identified or related to local data. Data collected does not clearly relate to problem statement or is limited in scope and source.
1 point	Data collected is based on anecdotal information and/or is vague.

1B) Academic Risk Factors Based on the data and data analysis of 1A, identify the academic risk factors for each target population. A needs inventory may be helpful in determining the needs of the community and the gaps in the services that are available. The services to be provided should be closely tied to the identified academic needs.

10 points	Participants and the academic risk factors are clearly identified. The needs of the community and the gaps in the services that are available are clearly identified. Past or current efforts have been clearly identified and referenced. Proposal appears to compliment and not duplicate existing efforts.
-----------	---

5 points	Participants and the academic risk factors are not clearly identified. The needs of the community and the gaps in the services that are available are not clearly identified. Past or current efforts have not been clearly identified and referenced. Unclear if the proposal compliments and not duplicates existing efforts.
1 point	Participants and the academic risk factors are inappropriately identified. The needs of the community and the gaps in the services that are available are not identified. There is no evidence of the past or current efforts.

2) Project Design, Goals and Measurable Objectives (30 points)

Principle of Effectiveness (B)- Activities must be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high quality academic enrichment opportunities. Clearly describe the activities to be provided by the project and elaborate on how these goals and objectives are linked to the identified needs. Clearly delineate the roles to be played by each of the partners, describing who will do what, when, and where, to what ends, and with what anticipated results. Tailor your activities to address the specific needs of program participants and to achieve the desired outcomes. For example, explain how your project will provide services and activities during extended hours that are not currently available during the regular school day, how project staff will vary their approaches to help meet a child’s individual needs, and how staff will collaborate with regular school day teachers to assess a student’s needs.

Include letters of commitment or memoranda of understanding that clearly indicate the role and capacity of each partnering organization discussed in the application. Applicants are advised that the quality of letters of support, with a clear demonstration of buy-in from senior administrators of the partnering organization, is more important than the quantity.

Principle of Effectiveness (C) - Design and implementation of activities must be based upon scientifically researched programs that provide evidence that the program or activity will help students meet the State and local student academic achievement standards In designing and improving their programs, grant recipients shall, taking into consideration their needs assessment and measurable goals and objectives, select and implement programs that have demonstrated that they can be effective in obtaining their identified goals. Grantees are encouraged to review the breadth of available research and evaluation literature in selecting effective strategies most responsive to their needs, and to replicate these strategies in a manner consistent with their original design

- (A) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

10 points	Goals and objectives are clearly specified, reasonable, and appropriate to this funding source. Objectives are measurable and meaningful and explain how goals will be met.
5 points	Goals and objectives are not clearly defined or described and may not be reasonable or appropriate to this funding source. Objectives are not clearly measurable and/or not meaningful. Objectives do not adequately describe how the goals will be met.
1 point	Goals and objectives are activity only and provide no indication of how they will be measured. Objectives are not defined and/or are not congruent with stated goals.

- (B) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the academic needs of the target population or other identified needs.

10 points	Participants are clearly identified and proposed activities clearly address academic at-risk factors. Design and implementation of activities are researched based programs that provide evidence that the program or activity will help students meet the State and local student academic achievement standards. Researched based program(s) selected clearly demonstrate that they can be effective in obtaining the identified goals.
5 points	Participants are not clearly identified and it is unclear if proposed activities clearly address academic at-risk factors. Design and implementation of activities are not based upon researched programs. Unclear if program can demonstrate effectiveness in obtaining identified goals.
1 point	Participants are inappropriately identified and proposed activities do not address at-risk factors. There is no evidence whether the proposed project will remedy the risk factors for each target population.

- (C) The extent to which the proposed project will establish linkages with other appropriate agencies and organizations providing services to the target population.

10 points	Letters of commitment or memoranda of understanding clearly indicate the role and capacity of each partnering organization discussed in the application. The contribution of partnering organization to achieving identified goals and objective is clear.
5 points	Letters of commitment or memoranda of understanding indicate the role and capacity of each partnering organization discussed in the application. The contribution of partnering organization to achieving identified goals and objective is unclear.
1 point	Letters of commitment or memoranda of understanding do not indicate the role and capacity of each partnering organization discussed in the application. The contribution of partnering organization to achieving identified goals and objective is not mentioned

3) Quality of Project Evaluation. (20 points)

The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

Submit a strong evaluation plan that will shape the development of the project from the beginning of the grant period. Include the program objectives and performance indicators for the 21st Century CLC Program, clear benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific objectives, and outcome measures to assess impact on student learning and behavior. Describe the evaluation design, indicating: (1) what types of data will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) what designs and methods will be used; (4) what instruments will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will become available; (7) how information will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program or activity, and to refine the performance measures; (8) how the data will be made available to the public upon request, with public notice of such availability; and (9) how information will provide accountability information to stakeholders about success at the project site(s).

20 points	The data that will be collected and when this data will be collected is clearly stated. How this data will be analyzed, when, and by who is clearly stated. How this information will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program or activity, and to refine the performance measures is clear. When and how the data will be made available to the public upon request, with public notice of such availability and how information will provide accountability information to stakeholders about success at the project site is clearly stated.
10 points	The data that will be collected and when this data will be collected is clearly stated. How this data will be analyzed, and when, is unclear. How this information will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program or activity, and to refine the performance measures is unclear. When and how the data will be made available to the public upon request, with public notice of such availability and how information will provide accountability information to stakeholders about success at the project site is not clearly addressed.
5 point	The data that will be collected and when this data will be collected is not stated. How this data will be analyzed, and when, is unclear. How this information will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program or activity, and to refine the performance measures is not addressed. When and how the data will be made available to the public upon request, with public notice of such availability and how information will provide accountability information to stakeholders about success at the project site is not addressed.

4) Quality of the management plan (20 points)

- (A) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (B) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.

Describe objectives, actors, events, beneficiaries, and anticipated results. It is recommended that you budget for and employ a project director and seek guidance and advice from a variety of members of the community. We also suggest that you address the issue of planning for sustainability after the grant period and elaborate upon how your school district and partnering organizations will assist in sustaining the project

4(A)

10 points	The management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget is clear. Description of the role and responsibility of all key staff are clearly defined. Timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks are clear and included. Plan provides resources for ongoing staff development and training. The issue of planning for sustainability after the grant period is clearly addressed.
5 points	The management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget is unclear. Description of the role and responsibility of all key staff are not clearly defined. No timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks are included. Plan provides limited resources for ongoing staff development and training. The issue of planning for sustainability after the grant period is not adequately addressed.
1 point	The management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget is unclear. Description of the role and responsibility of all key staff are not defined. Timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks are not included. Plan does not provide resources for ongoing staff development and training. The issue of planning for sustainability after the grant period is not addressed.

Quality of the management plan (continued)

4(B)

10 points	How a diversity of perspectives, including those of students, parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, or others will be used to refine, improve, strengthen the program or activity, and to refine the performance measures is clearly addressed.
5 points	How a diversity of perspectives, including those of students, parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, or others will be used to refine, improve, strengthen the program or activity, and to refine the performance measures is not clearly addressed.
1 point	How a diversity of perspectives, including those of students, parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, or others will be

	used to refine, improve, strengthen the program or activity, and to refine the performance measures is not addressed.
--	---

5) Adequacy of resources / Budget (10 points)

- The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.
- The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

Show that appropriate resources and personnel have been carefully allocated for the tasks and activities described in your application. Assure that the budget will adequately cover program expenses, including transportation. It is important to demonstrate how you will leverage existing school/ organization resources, such as computer labs, libraries, and classrooms to carry out your activities. Describe the resources that partners are contributing, such as the use of community recreational areas, staff, supplies, etc. Costs should be allocated, and will be judged, against the scope of the project and its anticipated benefits.

Please provide a detailed budget narrative that itemizes how you will use grant funds as well as funds from other sources. Remember that grant funds cannot be used to purchase facilities or support new construction and cannot supplant other federal, state, and local funds.

Adequacy of resources / Budget (continued)

10 points	Appropriate resources and personnel have been carefully allocated for the tasks and activities described in your application. Budget is very detailed and adequately covers program expenses, including transportation. The leveraging of existing school/ organization resources, such as computer labs, libraries, and classrooms to carry out your activities is clearly described. A description of the resources that partners are contributing, such as the use of community recreational areas, staff, supplies, is clearly indicated.
5 points	Appropriate resources and personnel have been carefully allocated for the tasks and activities described in your application. It is unclear if budget adequately covers program expenses, including transportation. The leveraging of existing school/ organization resources, such as computer labs, libraries, and classrooms to carry out your activities is not clearly described. A description of the resources that partners are contributing, such as the use of community recreational areas, staff, supplies, is not indicated.
1 point	Appropriate resources and personnel have been not been allocated for the tasks and activities described in your application. Budget does not cover all of the program expenses, including transportation. The leveraging of existing school/ organization resources, such as computer labs, libraries, and classrooms to carry out your activities is not described. A description of the resources that partners are contributing, such as the use of community recreational areas, staff, supplies, is not indicated.

5) School s in Need of Improvement

5	DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED
0	No designation

TOPIC	MAXIMUM POSSIBLE POINTS
Needs and data analysis	20 POINTS
Project Design, Goals, etc.	30 POINTS
EVALUATION	20 POINTS
MANAGEMENT	20 POINTS
BUDGET	10 POINTS
SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT	5 POINTS
	105 POINTS



Office of Public Instruction
Linda McCulloch, Superintendent
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

March 2002
COMMON ASSURANCES FOR FEDERAL
PROGRAMS—CERTIFICATION

District or Agency Name:

CO:

The authorized representative for federal programs listed below is the:

LE:

In addition, if a member of a special education cooperative, the authorized representative for federal special education funds is the:

Each legal entity, district, cooperative or agency that participates in one or more of the programs listed below **MUST** complete and return this form to the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) prior to the award of funds for any U.S. Department of Education administered program. **Submission of this form is not an application for funds and does not obligate the applicant or OPI for the programs. The following pages consolidate common assurances required by federal law that apply to the federal programs listed below. Additional specific program assurances may be included in the application or program plan for that individual program. If you have questions, please contact the OPI specialist listed as contact on the program descriptions that accompany this form.**

COMMON ASSURANCES

The Common Assurances listed in items 1-21 apply to all programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education through the Office of Public Instruction, including all programs found in the following Acts:

- ESEA Reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B, 20 USC §1400
- Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, 20 USC §2301
- Workforce Investment Act, 29 USC §2801
- Adult Basic Literacy Education, 42 USC §4959
- General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), 20 USC §1221
- Pro-Children's Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, §9532, 115 Stat. 1984

Certification: I certify that the Common Assurances for Federal Programs and Specific Program Assurances for those programs in which this legal entity, district, cooperative, or agency participates are accepted as the basic conditions for local participation and assistance in the operation of the projects/programs listed above. I also authorize the representative(s) designated above to make representations and commitments on behalf of the applicant under the provisions of each program.

Printed Name of Board Chair or Executive Officer

District/Applicant Name

Signature of Board Chair or Executive Officer

Date

Retain a copy of this entire document.

Please return this page no later than May 30, 2002, to:

Office of Public Instruction
Attn: Carol Gneckow
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

Return only this page to OPI.



The applicant, by signature of its Board Chair or Executive Officer on page 1 of this document, hereby assures the Montana Office of Public Instruction that the applicant will adhere to the following:

General

1. That each program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9306(a)(1), 115 Stat. 1971].
2. That the applicant will adopt and use proper methods of administering each such program, including the enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program; and the correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9306(a)(3), 115 Stat. 1971].
3. No policy of the district prevents, or otherwise denies participation in, constitutionally protected prayer in public elementary and secondary schools per guidance of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9524, 115 Stat. 1980].
4. No school or district that has a designated open forum or a limited public forum denies equal access or a fair opportunity to meet with, or discriminate against, any group officially affiliated with the Boy Scouts of America, or any other youth group listed in title 36 of the United States Code, that wishes to conduct a meeting within that designated open forum or limited public forum including denying such access or opportunity or discriminating for reasons based on the membership or leadership criteria or oath of allegiance to God and country of the Boy Scouts of America or of the youth group listed in title 36 of the United States Code [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9525, 115 Stat. 1981].
5. None of the funds under ESEA will be used for schools to develop or distribute, or operate programs or courses of instruction directed at youth that promotes or encourages sexual activity, distribute or aid in the distribution of obscene materials to minors on school grounds, provide sex education or HIV-prevention education unless that instruction is age appropriate and includes the health benefit of abstinence or to operate a program of contraceptive distribution in schools [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9526, 115 Stat. 1982].
6. Notwithstanding section 444(a)(5)(B) of the General Education Provisions Act and except that a student or parent of a student may request that the information not be released without written parental consent, each school receiving assistance under ESEA shall provide, on a request made by military recruiters or an institution of higher education, access to secondary student names, addresses, and telephone listings. Each school shall provide military recruiters the same access to secondary students as is provided generally to postsecondary educational institutions or to prospective employers of those students. Each district shall notify parents of the option to not release student information without prior written parental consent and shall comply with any request to do so [see Pub. L. No. 107-110, §9528, 115 Stat. 1983].
7. Any student determined to be attending a "persistently dangerous school" as defined by the Office of Public Instruction or who becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense, as determined by state law, while in or on the grounds of a public elementary or secondary school that the student attends, will be allowed to attend a safe public elementary or secondary school within the local school district [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9532, 115 Stat. 1984].
8. That no person shall permit smoking within any indoor facility (or portion of such facility) owned or leased or contracted for, and utilized by such person for the provision of routine or regular kindergarten, elementary or secondary education, library services, routine health care, day care or early childhood development services [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §4303, 115 Stat. 1774].

Funding, Fiscal Controls, Record Keeping and Reports

9. That the control of funds provided under each such program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency or in a nonprofit private agency institution, organization, or Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to such entities; and the public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution or

organization, or Indian tribe will administer such funds and property to the extent required by authorizing statutes [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9306(a)(2)(A)(B), 115 Stat. 1971].

10. That the applicant will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the state superintendent of public instruction and the secretary or other federal officials [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9306(a)(4), 115 Stat. 1971].

That expenditures of \$300,000 or more in a year in federal awards shall have a single or program-specific audit conducted for that year in accordance with the provisions of OMB Circular A-133 (OMB Circular A-133).

That federal awards are expended only for allowable activities and that the costs of goods and services charged to federal awards are allowable and in accordance with the applicable cost principles (20 USC 3474; OMB Circular A-102).

That the draw down of federal cash is only for immediate needs (20 USC 3474; OMB Circular A-102).

That proper records are maintained for equipment acquired with federal awards, equipment is adequately safeguarded and maintained, disposition or encumbrance of any equipment or real property is in accordance with federal requirements, and the federal awarding agency is appropriately compensated for its share of any property sold or converted to non-federal use (20 USC 3474; OMB Circular A-102).

That matching, level of effort, or earmarking requirements are met using only allowable funds or costs which are properly calculated and valued (20 USC 3474; OMB Circular A-102).

That federal funds are used only during the authorized period of availability (20 USC 3474; OMB Circular A-102) [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9201, 115 Stat. 1966].

That procurement of goods and services are made in compliance with the provisions of the A-102 Common Rule or OMB Circular A-110, as applicable, and that no subaward, contract, or agreements for purchases of goods or services is made with any debarred or suspended party (20 USC 3474; OMB Circular A-102).

That program income is correctly earned, recorded, and used in accordance with the program requirements (20 USC 3474; OMB Circular A-102).

That reports of federal awards submitted to the pass-through entity include all activity of the reporting period, are supported by underlying accounting or performance records, and are fairly presented in accordance with program requirements (20 USC 3474; OMB Circular A-102).

That required audits are obtained and appropriate corrective action is taken on audit findings (20 USC 1221e-3 & 3474; OMB Circulars A-102, & A-133).

11. That the applicant will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, federal funds paid to such applicant under each such program [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9306(a)(5), 115 Stat. 1971] in accordance with state school accounting and reporting policies as applicable (School Accounting Manual).
12. That the local education agency will make reports to the state superintendent of public instruction and to the secretary as may reasonably be necessary to enable the state education agency and the secretary to perform their duties and that the local education agency will maintain such records for three years and the current year or as required in school districts in the School District Records Schedule (Schedule No. 7) published by the Montana Department of Administration and provide access to those records, as the superintendent or secretary deem necessary to perform their duties [see Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9306(a)(6), 115 Stat. 1971].
13. That in the case of any project involving construction, the project is not inconsistent with overall state plans for the construction of school facilities, and in developing plans for construction due consideration will be given to excellence of architecture and design and to compliance with Appendix A of Part 36 of Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations (Americans With Disabilities Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities) or Appendix A of Part 101-19.6 of Title 41, Code of Federal Regulations (Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards).
14. That none of the funds expended under any applicable program will be used to acquire equipment (including computer software) in any instance in which such acquisition results in a direct financial benefit to any organization representing the interests of the purchasing entity or its employees or any affiliate of such organization [see Title XX of GEPA, 20 USC §2342(c)(11)].

15. Laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors to work on construction projects financed using federal assistance must be paid wages not less than those established for the local project area by the Secretary of Labor. [Davis Bacon Act, 40 Stat. 1494, 40 USC 276a-276a-s]

Participation

16. That before each application is submitted, the applicant will afford a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the application and has considered such comment [see Pub. L. No. 107-110, §9306](a)(7), 115 Stat. 1971].
17. That the applicant is in compliance with the federal regulations 34 CFR 75.650 [see Pub. L. No. 107-110, §9501(a)(1), 115 Stat. 1975] governing private school participation which require that public school subgrantees provide students enrolled in private schools with a genuine opportunity for equitable participation should private schools in the subgrantee's district wish to participate in federal programs. That the applicant who is in receipt of ESEA funding is in compliance with nonpublic school requirements including timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate nonpublic school officials (Title IX, Part E, ESEA).

Nondiscrimination

18. That the applicant assures that it will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 USC §2000d et seq., which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance; and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 USC §794, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap in programs receiving federal financial assistance; and Title IX of Education Amendments of 1972, as amended, 20 USC §1681 et seq., which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs receiving federal financial assistance; and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, 42 USC §6101 et seq., which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs receiving federal financial assistance; and all regulations, guidelines, and standards lawfully adopted under the above statutes by the U.S. Department of Education.

Gun-Free Schools

19. That the applicant is in compliance with the Gun-Free Schools Act requirements of §20-5-202, MCA.

Debarment and Suspension

20. That the applicant certifies that it is not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from participation by any federal department or agency, and agrees that it will not knowingly enter into any subcontract or subgrant with a person or agency who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from participation by any federal department or agency. If the applicant is unable to provide this certification, an explanation must be attached (see statutory detail in 34 CFR §85.105 and 85.110).

Lobbying and Political Activity

21. That the applicant certifies that federal funds will not be used for partisan political purposes of any kind by any person or organization involved in the administration of federally assisted programs. [Hatch Act (S USC 1501-508) and Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970, as amended by Title VI of Civil Services Reform Act (Pub. L. No. 95-454, §4728)]:
 - a. federal funds received for programs covered by this common assurance form will not be used to influence or attempt to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member, officer, or employee of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with awarding of any federal contract; making any federal grant or loan; entering into any cooperative agreement; and extending, continuing, renewing, amending, or modifying any federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.
 - b. if funds other than federally appropriated funds have been or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence any of the parties named above, Standard Form LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying" will be completed and submitted in accordance with its instructions and returned to OPI.
 - c. the language of this section will be included in any subcontracts entered into for funds received under programs covered by this common assurance form, and ensure that all subcontractors certify and disclose accordingly (see statutory detail 34 CFR §82).

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES

If participating in any of the programs listed below, the applicant, by signature of its Board Chair or Executive Officer on the first page of this document, assures the Montana Office of Public Instruction that the applicant will adhere to the following specific program assurances in addition to the previously listed common assurances:

MONTANA READING EXCELLENCE ACT PROGRAM

1. The local education agency (district):
 - a. will carry out professional development for the classroom teacher and other instructional staff on the teaching of reading based on scientifically based reading research;
 - b. will provide family literacy services based on programs such as Even Start Family Literacy model authorized under Part B of Title I, to enable parents to be their child's first and most important teacher [Pub. L. No. 107-110, §1111(c)(14), 115 Stat. 1444];
 - c. will carry out programs to assist those kindergarten students who are not ready for the transition to first grade, particularly students experiencing difficulty with reading skills; and
 - d. will use supervised individuals (including tutors), who have been appropriately trained using scientifically based reading research, to provide additional support, before school, after school, on weekends, during noninstructional periods of the school day, or during the summer, for children preparing to enter kindergarten and students in kindergarten through grade three who are experiencing difficulty reading.
2. The local education agency (district) shall make available, upon request and in an understandable and uniform format, to any parent of a student attending any school selected to receive assistance under subsection (d)(1) in the geographic area served by the local educational agency, information regarding the professional qualifications of the student's classroom teacher to provide instruction in reading.

TITLE I: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged Part A—Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies

1. That the applicant will inform eligible schools and parents of schoolwide project authority and the ability of such schools to consolidate funds from federal, state, and local sources [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(A), 115 Stat. 1465].
2. That the applicant will provide technical assistance and support to schoolwide programs [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(B), 115 Stat. 1465].
3. That the applicant will work in consultation with schools as the schools develop the schools' plans pursuant to Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(C), 115 Stat. 1465 and assist schools as the schools implement such plans or undertake activities pursuant to Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(C), 115 Stat. 1465 so that each school can make adequate yearly progress toward meeting the state content standards and state student performance standards.
4. That the applicant will fulfill such agency's school improvement responsibilities under Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1116, 115 Stat. 1478, including taking corrective actions under paragraphs (7) and (8) of Pub. L. No. 107-100 §1116(b), 115 Stat. 1478 [Pub. L. No. 107-110, §1112(c)(1)(D), 115 Stat. 1465].
5. That the applicant will provide services to eligible children attending private elementary and secondary schools in accordance with Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1120, 115 Stat. 1508 [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(E), 115 Stat. 1465], and timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials regarding such services.
6. That the applicant will take into account the experience of model programs for the educationally disadvantaged, and the findings of relevant scientifically based research indicating that services may be most effective if focused

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES (CONT.)

on students in the earliest grades at schools that receive funds under this part [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(F), 115 Stat. 1465].

7. That if an LEA chooses to use funds under this part, the applicant will provide early childhood development services to low-income children below the age of compulsory school attendance, and ensure that such services comply with the performance standards established under Section 641A(a) of the Head Start program [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(G), 115 Stat. 1465].
8. That the applicant will work in consultation with schools as the schools develop and implement their plans or activities under Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1118 and §1119, 115 Stat. 1501-1508 [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(H), 115 Stat. 1465].
9. That the applicant will comply with the requirements of Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1119, 115 Stat. 1505 [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(I), 115 Stat. 1465] regarding the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals and professional development.
10. That the applicant will inform eligible schools of the local educational agency's authority to obtain waivers on the school's behalf under Title IX [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(J), 115 Stat. 1465].
11. That the applicant will coordinate and collaborate to the extent feasible and necessary, as determined by the local education agency (LEA), with the state education agency and other agencies providing services to children, youth, and families with respect to a school in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Pub. L. No. 107-110, §1116, 115 Stat. 1478 if such a school requests assistance from the local educational agency in addressing major factors that have significantly affected student achievement at the school [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(K), 115 Stat. 1465].
12. That the applicant will ensure, through incentives for voluntary transfers, the provision of professional development, recruitment programs, or other effective strategies, that low-income students and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(L), 115 Stat. 1465].
13. That the applicant will participate, if selected, in the State National Assessment of Educational Progress in 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics carried out under section 411(b)(2) of the National Education Statistics Act of 1994 [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(b)(F), 115 Stat. 1465].
14. That the applicant will use the results of the student academic assessments required under Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 and other measures or indicators available to the agency, to review annually the progress of each school served by the agency and receiving funds under this part to determine whether all of the schools are making the progress necessary to ensure that all students will meet the state's proficient level of achievement on the state academic assessments described in Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 within 12 years from the baseline year described in Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(M), 115 Stat. 1466.
15. That the applicant will ensure that the results from the academic assessments required under Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1111(b)(3), 115 Stat. 1454 will be provided to parents and teachers as soon as is practicably possible after the test is taken, in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand [Pub. L. No. 107-110, §1112(c)(1)(N), 115 Stat. 1466].
16. That the applicant assist each school served by the agency and assisted under this part in developing or identifying examples of high-quality, effective curricula consistent with Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1111(b)(8)(D) [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1112(c)(1)(O), 115 Stat. 1466].
17. That the applicant has established and implemented: (1) a local educational agency wide salary schedule; (2) a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in teachers, administrators, and other staff; and (3) a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in the provision of curriculum materials and instructional supplies [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1120A(c)(2), 115 Stat. 1512].

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES (CONT.)

18. That the state educational agency or local educational agency shall use federal funds received under this part only to supplement the funds that would, in the absence of such federal funds, be made available from non-federal sources for the education of pupils participating in programs assisted under this part, and not to supplant such funds.

TITLE I, Part C-Education of Migratory Children

That the applicant assures that the special education and/or supportive services needs of migratory children have been identified, addressed and met prior to using any Part C funds for a schoolwide program and that migrant parental consent has been given and documented before using MEP funds for schoolwides. Additionally, any use of MEP funds in schoolwides must be done in consultation and with the approval of the SEA MEP [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1304, 115 Stat. 1574].

TITLE II: Preparing, Training and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals Part A-Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

1. That the applicant will target Title II, Part A funds to schools with the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers; have the largest class sizes; or are identified for school improvement under Title I [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §2122(b)(3), 115 Stat. 1628]. A highly-qualified teacher is one certified by the State of Montana and endorsed in the grade levels and subjects taught [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9101(23), 115 Stat. 1959].
2. That Title II, Part A services for students enrolled in both private and public schools are provided on an equitable basis and that annually the district will make every reasonable effort to offer Title II services to children enrolled in known private schools within the district [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §2122(b)(11), 115 Stat. 1629].
3. That all Title II, Part A professional development activities will be decided by a committee and will be based upon scientifically researched practices and a data-driven local needs assessment [Pub. L. No. 107-110 2122(b)(6), 115 Stat. 1628]. That the committee will be composed of teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, other relevant school staff, and parents [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §2122(b)(7), 115 Stat. 1628].
4. That the district will use Title II, Part A funds only to supplement, not supplant, funds from non-Federal sources that would otherwise be used for activities authorized under Title II, Part A [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §2123(b), 115 Stat. 1632].
5. That teachers hired with these funds are highly qualified and meet the requirements of the law [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §2123 (a)(2) and (7), 115 Stat. 1629 and 1631]. A highly qualified teacher is one certified by the State of Montana and endorsed in the grade levels and subjects taught [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §9101(23), 115 Stat. 1959].

TITLE II, Part D-Enhancing Education Through Technology

1. That the applicant will have a new or updated local long-range strategic educational technology plan that is consistent with the objectives of the statewide educational technology plan [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §2414, 115 Stat. 1676]. The technology plan shall also include:
 - a. a description of how the applicant will use Title II, Part D funds to improve student academic achievement, including the technology literacy of all students, and to improve the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction;
 - b. the applicant's specific goals for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement, aligned with state content and performance standards;
 - c. the steps that will be taken to ensure that all students and teachers have increased access to educational

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES (CONT.)

technology, including how the LEA will use funds under Title II, Part D with funds from other sources to ensure that:

- 1) Students in high-poverty and high-needs schools will have access to technology, and
- 2) Teachers are prepared to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction;

- d. a description of how the applicant will identify and promote curricula and teaching strategies that integrate technology effectively into curriculum instruction, based on a review of relevant research, leading to improvements in student academic achievement;
 - e. provide ongoing, sustained professional development for district staff to further the effective use of technology in the classroom or library media center (a minimum of 25 percent of funds received must be used for professional development);
 - f. a description of the type and costs of technologies to be acquired under this funding including services, software and digital curricula, and including specific provisions for interoperability among components of such technologies;
 - g. a description of how the activities provided with funds from this part will be coordinated with funds available from other federal, state and local sources;
 - h. a description of how technology will be integrated into curricula and instruction and a timeline for such integration;
 - i. a description of how the applicant will encourage the development and utilization of innovative strategies for the delivery of specialized or rigorous academic courses and curricula through the use of technology, including distance learning technologies, particularly for areas that would not otherwise have access to such courses and curricula due to geographical isolation or insufficient resources;
 - j. a description of how the applicant will ensure the effective use of technology to promote parental involvement and increase communication with parents, including how parents will be informed of the technology being applied in their child's education so that the parents are able to reinforce at home the instruction their child receives at school;
 - k. a description of how programs will be developed, where applicable, in collaboration with adult literacy service providers to maximize the use of technology;
 - l. a description of the process and accountability measures that will be used to evaluate the extent to which activities funded are effective in integrating technology into the curricula and instruction, increasing the ability of teachers to teach, and enabling students to meet challenging state academic content and performance standards; and
 - m. a description of the supporting resources (services, software and other electronically delivered learning materials, and print resources) that will be acquired to ensure successful and effective uses of technology.
2. That the applicant will certify (annually) that if funds under this part are used to purchase computers, software, services, supplies or materials to access the Internet, or pay for direct costs associated with accessing the Internet, the LEA has in place a policy of Internet safety [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §2441, 115 Stat. 1685, Internet Safety] for minors and staff members that:
 - a. Protects (filters) against access through such computers to visual depictions that
 - 1) Contain obscenity;
 - 2) Contain child pornography; and
 - 3) Would be harmful to minors.
 - b. Ensures the operation of such technology protection measures (filter) during use of such computers (especially by minors).
 3. That the applicant will certify that funds received under this part will supplement, not supplant, state and local funds.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES (CONT.)

TITLE III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students Part A-English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement

1. That the LEA will consult with parents of the children to be served in developing the program, and that parental permission will be obtained to serve students in the program.
2. That the LEA will assess limited English proficient students annually [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §3116(d), 115 Stat. 1700].

TITLE IV: 21st Century Schools Part A-Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

1. That 20 USC §7115 and §7116 of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act regarding:
 - timely, meaningful, and continued consultation with state and local government, school staff, parents, community based organizations and others;
 - analyzing current use of tobacco, alcohol and controlled, illegal and addictive or harmful substances and violence, safety and discipline problems among students who attend the schools of the applicant, and that the analysis is based on ongoing local assessment or evaluation activities;
 - adopting and implementing a comprehensive drug and violence prevention program in the schools that conveys a clear and consistent message that violence and illegal drug use are wrong and harmful, that complies with the Principles of Effectiveness and fosters a safe and drug-free learning environment.
 - developing an evaluation and reporting system that includes the prevalence of drug use and violence by youth in the schools and the community; and
 - coordinating the local plan for drug and violence prevention with other IASA federally funded programs in which the district participates and with other community programs.
2. That the applicant assures that it has reviewed curricula it intends to use and that such curricula will meet the needs of the schools served by the applicant; and assures that the LEA program is an age-appropriate, developmentally based drug abuse and violence education and prevention program for students throughout all grades of the schools (from early childhood through grade 12) operated or served by the applicant [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §4115, 115 Stat. 1745].
3. That the applicant assures that its local drug and violence prevention program is a comprehensive program designed for all students and employees to create a disciplined environment conducive to learning, prevent violence and promote school safety, prevent the use, possession and distribution of tobacco, alcohol and illegal drugs by students, and prevent the illegal use, possession and distribution of those substances by employees [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §4115, 115 Stat. 1745].
4. That the applicant assures that it has a safe schools plan in place that includes: school discipline policies, security procedures at school and while students are on the way to and from school, a crisis management plan for responding to traumatic incidents on school grounds, and a code of conduct policy for all students [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §4114(d)(7), 115 Stat. 1744].
5. That the funds will be used to supplement and not supplant other non-federal funds that would be otherwise available.

TITLE IV: 21st Century Schools Part B-21st Century Community Learning Centers

1. That the program will take place in a safe and easily accessible facility [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §4204(b)(2)(A), 115 Stat. 1770].

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES (CONT.)

2. That the program was developed and will be carried out in active collaboration with the schools the students attend [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §4204(b)(2)(D), 115 Stat. 1770].
3. That the program complies with the Principles of Effectiveness and fosters a safe and drug-free learning environment [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §4204(b)(2)(E), 115 Stat. 1770].
4. That the program will primarily target students who attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under Pub. L. No. 107-110 §1114, 115 Stat. 1471 and the families of such students [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §4204(b)(2)(F), 115 Stat. 1770].
5. That the funds will be used to supplement and not supplant other non-federal funds that would be otherwise available [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §4203(a)(9), 115 Stat. 1768].

TITLE V: Promoting Informed Parental Choice and Innovative Programs Part A-Innovative Programs

1. That Title V, Part A services for students enrolled in both private and public schools are provided on an equitable basis and that annually the district will make every reasonable effort to offer Title V, Part A services to children enrolled in known private schools within the district [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §5133(b)(5), 115 Stat. 1783].
2. That all Title V, Part A activities will be decided through systematic consultation with school personnel and parents; will be based upon scientifically researched practices and a data-driven local needs assessment; and will be evaluated annually [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §5133(b)(7) and (8), 115 Stat. 1783].
3. That the district will use Title V, Part A funds only to supplement, not supplant, funds from non-federal sources that would otherwise be used for activities authorized under Title V [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §5144, 115 Stat. 1788].

TITLE VI: Flexibility and Accountability

1. That Title VI services for children enrolled in both private and public schools are provided on an equitable basis in accordance with ESEA, as amended by Section 6402 of Pub. L. No. 103-382, and that annually the district will make every reasonable effort to offer Title VI services to children enrolled in known private schools within the district [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §6141(c)(1)(K), 115 Stat. 1880].
2. That in the design, planning and implementation of programs authorized by Title VI, the district will provide for systematic consultation with parents, teachers, and administrative personnel, and with other groups involved in the implementation of Title VI (such as librarians, school counselors, and other pupil services personnel) as may be considered appropriate by the local education agency [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §6141(c)(1)(C), 115 Stat. 1879].
3. That the district will use Title VI funds only to supplement, not supplant, funds from nonfederal sources (including, to the extent practical, to increase the level of nonfederal funding sources that would be made available in the absence of Title VI funds) [Pub. L. No. 107-110 §6141(c)(1)(L), 115 Stat. 1880].

TITLE X Repeals, Redesignations, and Amendments to Other Statutes Part C-Homeless Education McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act 42 USC 11431, et seq.

1. That the applicant will designate an appropriate staff person, as a local education agency liaison for homeless children and youth in compliance with Pub. L. No. 107-110, Title X, Part C, Subtitle B §722(g)(1)(J), 115 Stat. 1996 and assure that such liaison follows the guidelines in (g)(6)(A).

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES (CONT.)

2. That LEA's in the state will adopt policies and practices to ensure that homeless children and youths are not stigmatized or segregated on the basis of their status as homeless [Pub. L. No. 107-110, Title X, Part C, Subtitle B, §722(g)(1)(J), 115 Stat. 1996].
3. That the LEA will adopt policies and practices to ensure that transportation is provided, at the request of the parent or guardian, to and from the school of origin [Pub. L. No. 107-110, Title X, Part C, Subtitle B §722(g)(1)(J)(iii), 115 Stat. 1996].

ADULT BASIC LITERACY EDUCATION [Pub. L. No. 105-220]

1. That the eligible agency will award not less than one grant to an eligible provider who offers flexible schedules and necessary support services (such as child care and transportation) to enable individuals, including individuals with disabilities, or individuals with other special needs, to participate in adult education and literacy activities, which eligible provider shall attempt to coordinate with support services that are not provided under this subtitle prior to using funds for adult education and literacy activities provided under this subtitle for support services.
2. That the funds received under this subtitle will not be expended for any purpose other than for activities under this subtitle.
3. That the eligible agency will expend the funds under this subtitle in a manner consistent with fiscal requirements in Section 241.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Part B-Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

1. That the applicant will comply with the final regulations under IDEA '97 and state laws and rules governing the provision of special education and related services to eligible children with disabilities;
2. That Part B funds will be used only to pay the excess costs of providing special education and related services to children with disabilities consistent with Sections 300.184-300.185 of IDEA (34 CFR 300.230);
3. Part B funds will be used to supplement state, local and other federal funds and not to supplant those funds (34 CFR 300.230);
4. Part B funds will not be used to reduce the level of expenditures for the education of children with disabilities made by the district(s) from local, or state and local funds below the level of those expenditures for the preceding fiscal year unless the reduction is attributable to any of the exceptions allowed under IDEA (34 CFR 300.231-232);
5. The funds received under Part B will be expended in accordance with applicable provisions of IDEA (34 CFR 300.230);
6. To the extent consistent with their number and location, provision is made for the participation of private school children with disabilities by providing them with special education and related services in accordance with 34 CFR 300.450-300.462;
7. All eligible children with disabilities, beginning on their third birthday, are provided all the rights and protections guaranteed by IDEA and its implementing regulations (34 CFR 300.300); and
8. The applicant and its member districts (if the applicant is a cooperative or an applicant for a consortium) will follow the policies and procedures contained in its Program Narrative as submitted to the Division of Special Education, Office of Public Instruction, spring 2001. If any modifications to the applicant's policies and procedures are deemed necessary by the applicant, the applicant will submit the proposed modifications to the Office of Public Instruction for review prior to their adoption (34 CFR 300.182, 300.220; ARM 10.16.3220).

Checklist For Consultations

General Items—To ensure timely and meaningful consultation, a local educational agency shall consult with appropriate nonpublic school officials during the design and development of the district’s programs under this part, on issues such as:

- _____ How the children’s needs will be identified;
- _____ What services will be offered;
- _____ How, where, and by whom the services will be provided;
- _____ How the services will be assessed (academically assessed in Title I, Part A) and how the results of that assessment will be used to improve those services;
- _____ The size and scope of the equitable services to be provided to the eligible nonpublic school children, and the amount of funds available for those services;
- _____ How and when the district will make decisions about the delivery of services to such children including a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the nonpublic school officials on the provision of services through a contract with potential third-party providers; and
- _____ How, if the district disagrees with the views of the nonpublic school officials on the provision of services through a contract, the local educational agency will provide in writing to such nonpublic school officials an analysis of the reasons why the local educational agency has chosen not to use a contractor.
- _____ **TIMING**—Such consultation shall include meetings of district and nonpublic school officials and shall occur before the local educational agency makes any decision that affects the opportunities of eligible nonpublic school children to participate in programs under this part. Such meetings shall continue throughout implementation and assessment of services provided under this section.
- _____ **DISCUSSION**—Such consultation shall include a discussion of service delivery mechanisms a local educational agency can use to provide equitable services to eligible nonpublic school children.

Additional requirements for those districts receiving Title I, Part A funding.

- _____ For Title I, Part A only, the method or sources of data that are used to determine the number of children from low-income families in participating school attendance areas who attend nonpublic schools;
- _____ **DOCUMENTATION**—Each local educational agency shall maintain in the district’s records and provide to the State educational agency involved a written affirmation signed by officials of each participating nonpublic school that the consultation required by this section has occurred. **The required form for the nonpublic school signature will meet this requirement when the district submits the signed forms of the participating nonpublic schools attached to the public district summary form.** If nonpublic school officials do not provide such affirmation within a reasonable period of time, the local educational agency shall forward the documentation that such consultation has taken place to the state educational agency. The indication of “NR” for “No Response” will document this on the public district summary form.

All nonpublic schools located within the district boundaries were notified and consulted on participation in the federal programs identified in the information provided. **Documentation of notification will be retained in the district office for review if requested by a program specialist or an auditor.**

Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Check appropriate box)

- District Superintendent
- Principal (if no District Superintendent)
- County Superintendent (if no District Superintendent or Principal)

This form must be used by the district to obtain information from nonpublic schools. Nonpublic schools must return these forms to the local district.

2002-2003 Opportunity to Participate in Federally Funded Programs by Nonpublic Schools

Return form to Local School District

This section to be completed by LOCAL district:

OPI USE

LE: _____

CO: _____

Due date for return to public school district: _____

Check one:

Elem

HS

K-12

Name of PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT within which the nonpublic school is located.

County

This section to be completed by official representing the NONPUBLIC school:

Name of NONPUBLIC SCHOOL

Private School

Home School

OPI USE

LE: _____

CO: _____

Address

City/State/ZIP

Phone No.

For the federal programs for which this district receives funding, or may receive funding, please check each federal program in which this nonpublic school wishes to participate in school year 2002-2003. Some of the listed programs are competitive or may have limits on eligible districts.

	Yes	No		Yes	No
ESEA Title I, Part A—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged (T I A)	_____	_____	ESEA Title IV, Part A—Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities (T IV A)	_____	_____
ESEA Title I, Part B, Subpart 1—Reading First or the Predecessor Program, Reading Excellence (T I B 1)	_____	_____	ESEA Title IV, Part B—21st Century Community Learning Centers (T IV B)	_____	_____
ESEA Title I, Part B, Subpart 3—Even Start Family Literacy (T I B 3)	_____	_____	ESEA Title V, Part A—Innovative Programs (T V A)	_____	_____
ESEA Title I, Part C—Migrant Education Program (T I C)	_____	_____	School Nutrition Programs (SF)	_____	_____
ESEA Title II, Part A—Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment Fund (T II A)	_____	_____	Special Education IDEA, Part B (SE B)	_____	_____
ESEA Title II, Part D—Enhancing Education Through Technology (T II D)	_____	_____	Special Education (IDEA) Preschool (Ages 3-5) (SE P)	_____	_____
ESEA Title III, Part a—Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students (T III A)	_____	_____	Carl Perkins Vocational Education (Vo Ed)	_____	_____

All Nonpublic School Officials, please check 1 or 2 below:

1. This nonpublic school does not wish to participate in any of the above listed programs.
2. This nonpublic school wishes to participate in the programs checked above. I assure the above public school district that this school will comply with provisions of each federal program in which it participates.

If the district receives Title I, Part A funds, please check "Yes" or "No" for consultation received.

3. This nonpublic school received the required consultation in a meaningful and timely manner with regard to services from Title I, Part A, if the district receives those funds. Yes No

Responsible Nonpublic School Official

Printed or Typed Name

Signature

Title

Date

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged Part A—Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

Title I, Part A of Public Law 107-110, was enacted to provide financial assistance to districts to expand and improve their educational programs to meet the needs of students who are at risk of failing to meet the state's challenging academic standards.

- Title I projects must be designed to provide supplemental services to assist children at the elementary and secondary school levels to achieve the state's challenging content and performance standards.
- The development of programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents of participating public and nonpublic school children, including parent input into the planning, design and implementation of the district's Title I project, is required.
- A district is eligible to receive funds based on criteria established in Public Law 107-110. Grants are awarded to eligible districts as a result of the review and approval of the local application by the Office of Public Instruction.
- Nonpublic school students with academic needs who reside in Title I attendance areas may receive equitable services to the extent possible with funds generated by low-income nonpublic school students.
- Districts should receive notification from the Office of Public Instruction of their Title I allocation during the month of May, if Congress has appropriated funds for the program on schedule.
- Funds may be used to provide supplementary services to increase the learning levels of low-achieving students in Title I eligible schools.

If you have questions regarding ESEA Title I, Part A programs, please contact Gwen Smith, Administrative Assistant, at (406) 444-5660, e-mail gsmith@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title I, Part B, Subpart 1—Reading First and the Predecessor, Reading Excellence Program

The Reading First Program provides a grant to each state to improve early reading instruction the grades K-3 in eligible schools and districts. Programs must be based on scientifically based reading research. Priorities for competitive grants are for low-income schools and those identifying as in need of improvement under Title I, Part A.

The Reading Excellence Program (REA) is very similar but preceded Reading First under a former law. Montana has funds until August 2004. Local grants have similar priorities as in Reading First and are intended to support reading reform in grades K-3 and family literacy programs.

If you have questions regarding ESEA Title I, Part B, Subpart 1 programs, please contact Marsha Davis, REA Project Director, at (406) 444-0793, e-mail mdavis@state.mt.us or Debbie Hunsaker, Reading Excellence Program Specialist, at (406) 444-0733, e-mail dhunsaker@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title I, Part B, Subpart 3—Even Start Family Literacy Program

- To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving educational opportunities of the nation's low income families by integrating early childhood education, adult basic literacy or adult basic education and parenting education into a unified family program.
- To be an eligible entity for an Even Start subgrant an applicant must have representative(s) from a local school district, and one or more of the following: a nonprofit community-based organization, a public agency other than a school district, an institution of higher education, public and/or a private institution.

If you have questions regarding ESEA Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 programs, please contact Joan Morris, Even Start Specialist, at (406) 444-3083, e-mail jmorris@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title I, Part C—Migrant Education Program

The Migrant Education Program is federally funded. State education agency-operated program that provides supplemental education and supportive services to eligible migrant children to help them overcome educational disruptions and disadvantages. A child is eligible for services who is: younger than 22 and has not graduated from high school or does not hold a GED and has moved with her/his parent or guardian (or by herself/himself in the case of emancipated youth) across international (in the case of Mexico and Canada), state, county or school district boundaries within the preceding 36 months to seek or obtain temporary or seasonal employment in agriculture or fishing work.

Subgrants for the Migrant Education Program are based on the number and needs of eligible children located throughout the state. By statute, priority is given to migrant children whose education has been disrupted and/or who are at risk of failure to meet challenging state standards. Districts with eligible migrant children are invited to complete an application, which describes the scope of services to be delivered. Besides supplementary educational services in reading, math, writing and other content areas, migrant funds can be spent on transportation, preschool services, drop-out retrieval, technology instruction and acquisition, English as a Second Language, and other supportive services such as outreach and advocacy.

If you have questions regarding ESEA Title I, Part C programs, please contact Angela Branz-Spall, State Director, at (406) 444-2423, e-mail angelab@state.mt.us; Pat Wade, Program Assistant, at (406) 444-2509, e-mail pwade@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title II, Part A—Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment Fund

The purpose of this program is to (1) increase student achievement through such strategies as improving teacher and principal quality and increasing the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools; and, (2) hold local educational agencies and schools accountable for improvements in student achievement.

- All public local education agencies are eligible to apply. If there are private schools within a district boundary, the local district must include the private school staff in its Title II program if the private school staff wishes to participate. Local education agencies shall consult with appropriate private school officials during the design and development of the district Title II program.
- Program plans must be based upon scientifically based research. Such plans shall be developed to address the greatest needs of students and staff, with a priority to raise student achievement, particularly of low-performing students. These needs are identified through an assessment of local needs, which include the needs of nonpublic school students and staff. Services for nonpublic staff must be equitable in comparison to services for district public school teachers and principals.

If you have questions about the Title II, Part A program, please contact Patricia Johnson at (406) 444-2736, e-mail patjohnson@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title II, Part D—Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech) Program

The primary goal of the Ed Tech program is to improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools. It is also designed to assist every student regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability in becoming technologically literate by the end of eighth grade, and to encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum development to promote research-based instructional methods that can be widely replicated.

Equitable participation of nonpublic school students and personnel applies to this program. (See ESEA Section 9501 (b)(1).

LEAs and eligible local entities must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate nonpublic school officials during the design and development of programs and continue the consultation throughout the implementation of these programs. Therefore, for both Ed Tech formula and competitive awards, the consultation should begin during the development of the local grant proposals.

For more information regarding Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech) Program, contact Michael Hall at (406) 444-4422, or e-mail mhall@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title III—Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students

The purpose of the program is to help ensure that LEP students become proficient in English and attain state standards.

- Funding for school districts will be allotted on a formula basis according to the number of LEP and immigrant students in the district, not less than \$10,000 per LEA.
- Funding for professional development administered by the U.S. Department of Education on a competitive basis.
- Administration costs are limited to 2 percent at the LEA level.
- Accountability:
 - 1) Demonstrated improvements in English proficiency.
 - 2) Annual assessments for LEP students.
 - 3) LEAs and SEA submit written evaluation to the U.S. Department of Education.
 - 4) LEAs assure consultation and parental notification.

If you have questions on these or other programs which may be available to limited English proficient students, call Lynn Hinch at (406) 444-3482, e-mail lhinch@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title IV, Part A—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

- The SDFSC program (Title IV Part A of ESEA), is designed to support programs that prevent violence in and around schools; that prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs; that involve parents and communities; and that are coordinated with federal, state, school and community efforts to foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports student academic achievement.
- The SDFSC program authorizes drug and alcohol prevention education, violence prevention education, professional development for school staff, parents and community members, activities that serve to improve or enhance the comprehensive safety of the school environment, limited expenses for security measures, and identification and intervention services for certain at-risk populations or situations.
- Nonpublic schools may participate through the public school; nonpublic schools cannot apply for funds directly.

If you have questions regarding the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program, call Judy Birch at (406) 444-5663, email: jbirch@state.mt.us or Cathy Kendall at (406) 444-0829, email: cakendall@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title IV, Part B—21st Century Community Learning Centers

- 21st Century Community Learning Center funds provide opportunities for academic enrichment during before-school, after-school and summer hours in a community learning center environment. Services must reinforce and complement regular academic programs, and offer literacy and educational development to families.
- Projects must offer students a broad array of additional services and activities such as youth development, drug and violence prevention, counseling, art, music and recreation, technology education and character education. Families must be offered opportunities for literacy and related educational development. Programs must conform to the principles of effectiveness.
- Funds are accessed through a competitive grant program administered through the Office of Public Instruction. Grants are awarded for no less than three years, with annual reapplication required.
- Eligible applicants for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant program include public schools, community-based organizations, other public or private entities, or a consortium of two or more of such agencies or entities. Award priority is given to eligible entities that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families.

If you have questions regarding the 21st Century Learning Centers Program, call Judy Birch at (406) 444-5663, email: jbirch@state.mt.us or Cathy Kendall at (406) 444-0829, email: cakendall@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Title V, Part A—Innovative Programs

The purpose of Title V, Part A is to provide supplemental funds for innovative education programs leading to educational improvement, based on locally identified needs and an approved plan. Therefore, many uses of these funds are allowable, ranging from the purchase of supplementary instructional material, to professional development, to implementing school reform based upon scientifically based research.

- Nonpublic schools (private or home schools) may participate in Title V, Part A programs in one of two ways. They may ask to be included in the school district's Title V program, or if their needs are different, they may request the district to provide allowable Title V services to meet their needs. Nonpublic schools cannot receive Title V funds directly, but may benefit from funds spent by the public school district. In either case, the district's per pupil expenditure for services for public and nonpublic students will be equal, and is less than \$10 per pupil on average.
- In order to receive Title V, Part A services from the district, nonpublic schools must consult with the district soon after they return the sign-off form expressing their intent to participate. A district must know how the nonpublic school wants to participate before it submits its annual application for funds.

If you have questions about the Title V, Part A program, please contact Patricia Johnson at (406) 444-2736, e-mail patjohnson@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

School Nutrition Programs

School Nutrition Programs within the Division of Health Enhancement and Safety, administers the school nutrition programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The programs are: National School Lunch Program, School Breakfast Program, Afterschool Snack Program, Special Milk Program, Summer Food Service Program, USDA Donated Food Program and the Team Nutrition Training Program.

Nutrition and nutrition education are top priorities in the school nutrition programs. Rather than simply providing food, school nutrition programs empower children to make healthy food choices and take part in regular physical activity as part of their healthy lifestyle.

Private nonprofit schools may make written application to the Office of Public Instruction for a school to operate the school nutrition programs. Applicants shall provide the state agency with sufficient information to determine eligibility. The private nonprofit school must sign and submit an agreement, common assurances, a free and reduced-price policy statement, and comply with other program responsibilities such as program administration, preparation and service of nutritious meals, use of program funds, program monitoring, and reporting and record keeping requirements.

If you have questions regarding School Nutrition Programs, please call (406) 444-2501 or contact Christine Emerson, Director at (406) 444-2502 or e-mail cemerson@state.mt.us.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

In accordance with state administrative rule 10.16.3122, the local education agency in which a student with disability resides is responsible for ensuring the student with disabilities, age 3 through 18, beginning on the student's third birthday, including students with disabilities who have been suspended or expelled from school, has available a free, appropriate public education in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ENROLLED BY THEIR PARENTS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

For purposes of implementing the definition in 34 CFR 300.450, Montana's nonpublic schools, including home schools, are considered to be private schools.

- Each local education agency shall ensure that all students with disabilities living within the boundaries of the local education agency are identified, located and evaluated. If the student is parentally enrolled in a private school outside the boundaries of the local education agency in which the student is living, the local education agency where the private school is located is responsible for child find activities through referral (10.16.3125 ARM).
- No private school child with a disability has an individual right to receive some or all of the special education and related services that the child would receive if enrolled in a public school (34 CFR 300.454). Decisions about the services that will be provided to private school children with disabilities must be made in accordance with the requirements of IDEA. The public school, following consultations with appropriate representatives of private school children with disabilities, in light of the funding under 34 CFR 300.453, the number of private school children with disabilities, the needs of private school children with disabilities, and their location shall decide which children will receive services, what services will be provided, how and where the services will be provided, and how the services will be evaluated.

For further information, contact your local public school or the Division of Special Education, Office of Public Instruction at (406) 444-5661.

Nonpublic School Federal Program Descriptions

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Act of 1998

- “It is the purpose of this act to make the United States more competitive in the world economy by developing more fully the academic and occupational skills of all segments of the population. This purpose will principally be achieved through concentrating resources on improving education programs leading to academic and occupational skill competencies need to work in a technologically advanced society.”
- Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Act of 1998 provides funds to local education agencies (LEAs) to improve Vocational Education Programs, particularly those programs in need of improvement and that have the highest concentration of special population students.
- Title I, known as the basic grant, requires that 75 percent of the total funds be allocated by formula to LEAs and postsecondary vocational schools.
- Nonpublic schools may participate through a public school; nonpublic schools cannot apply for funds directly.

If you have specific questions regarding Federal Vocational Education Programs, please contact Karla Beagles, Program Assistant, at (406) 444-9019, or e-mail kbeagles@state.mt.us.